



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

## XI.—CHAUCER AND THE SEVEN DEADLY SINS<sup>1</sup>

In a series of recent articles<sup>2</sup> Professor Frederick Tupper has put forward, with great skill and learning, a view regarding the plan of the *Canterbury Tales* which demands, on account of its originality and its importance, the most respectful and open-minded consideration. As one who was fortunate enough to be present at the inception of the theory, and who welcomed enthusiastically the promise of fresh light which it seemed to hold, I am free, I think, from antecedent prejudice. But as the theory has been developed in article after article I have felt myself compelled to dissent, with steadily strengthening conviction, from Professor Tupper's contention, and it is the purpose of this article to make clear the grounds on which it seems to me that that contention, in spite of its uncommon plausibility, must be rejected. All stu-

<sup>1</sup> The *Beiblatt zur Anglia* for October-November, 1914, which contains (pp. 327-32) Koch's review of Tupper's article in the *Publications*, reached me (on account of delays presumably due to the war) on March 2nd, a week after the last sentence of this paper had been written. Professor Koch's conclusions and my own agree in general, and often in detail. I have, however, left this examination precisely as it stood, inasmuch as its angle of approach is somewhat different from Koch's, and its scope considerably wider.

<sup>2</sup> "Chaucer and the Seven Deadly Sins," *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America*, xxix (March, 1914), pp. 93-128 (hereafter referred to as *Publications*) ; "Wilful and Impatient Poverty," *Nation*, vol. 99, No. 2558 (July 9, 1914), p. 41 (referred to as *Nation*) ; "The Pardoner's Tavern," *Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, xiii (Oct., 1914), pp. 553-65 (referred to as *Journal*) ; "Chaucer's Bed's Head," *Modern Language Notes*, xxx (Jan. 1915), pp. 5-12 (referred to as *Notes*) ; compare also "Saint Venus and the Canterbury Pilgrims," *Nation*, vol. 97, No. 2520 (Oct. 16, 1913), pp. 354-56.

dents of Chaucer are under a debt to Mr. Tupper, whether they agree with him or not. A fresh and original conception, maintained with an enthusiasm that vivifies dead facts, is of all too rare occurrence, and its "Forth, beste, out of thy stal" is wholesome stimulus. But Mr. Tupper would be the last to wish his vigorous challenge to gird up our loins and give a reason for the faith that is in us, to go unanswered. He has already offered hospitality to various objections in his articles,<sup>3</sup> but he and his critics have not met, apparently, on common ground. In my own case I wish to accept, without question, his own choice of field and weapons.

For Mr. Tupper insists with some vehemence that those who fail to assent to his conclusions thus fail on account of a lack of "the mediæval perspective," or because of a "critical astigmatism that either disregards the text altogether or sees it blurredly through the medium of modern lenses."<sup>4</sup> In what follows, therefore, I shall confine myself rigidly to an examination of his argument *on the basis of those authorities alone which he himself cites*. And I shall ask regarding these authorities—and Chaucer as well—only the question which Mr. Tupper has himself suggested: "What did our mediæval thinker mean by this?"<sup>5</sup> And the point of view which I shall endeavor to maintain throughout is that of the mediæval reader—the same "every man of the Middle Ages" to

<sup>3</sup> See *Publications*, pp. 124 ff.; *Journal*, p. 565.

<sup>4</sup> *Journal*, p. 565; cf. pp. 553-54. One could wish that Mr. Tupper had left the exemplification of one of his Sins entirely to the Manciple. "Chydinge and reproche . . . [is] if he repreve him uncharitably of sinne, as 'thou [Peter Bell of scholarship],' 'thou [attenuating scholiast],' and so forth" (*Parson's Tale*, § 42). Still, like Phoebe, one had rather hear Tupper chide than less racy writers woo.

<sup>5</sup> *Journal*, p. 554.

whom, in the articles in question, the appeal is constantly made. It is scarcely necessary to say, I think, to those who will read this paper, that I am in the fullest possible accord with the position that mediæval literature must be interpreted in the light of "the conventions, the pre-conceptions, the literary *milieu*" of the mediæval author's times.<sup>6</sup> It is, however, precisely because I regard Mr. Tupper's interpretation, in its postulates and its conclusions, as inconsistent with mediæval modes of thought that I take issue with it. I am not in the least concerned, for the moment, with its bearing upon Chaucer's art. *A priori*, I could greet Mr. Tupper's Chaucer "as lightly as I were a larke," and as a stranger give him welcome. But the case is not *a priori*; it rests absolutely upon its author's interpretation of the mediæval point of view, upon the way in which he deals with mediæval facts. The merits or demerits of the thesis *per se* are irrelevant, if it is based on a mis-reading of those facts. It is the foundations of Mr. Tupper's theory, then, that concern us here.<sup>7</sup> And in examining these foundations my aim is so nearly identical with his, that I cannot find better words for its expression than his own: "This article is an implicit plea not only for the imaginative insight which enables us to enter into the life of another age and to read its poet's words aright, but also for that humbler every-day quality of accurate observation which alone makes it possible for us to read a poet's words at all."<sup>8</sup>

<sup>6</sup> See *Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, VIII, pp. 513-69.

<sup>7</sup> I am compelled to emphasize this, for Tupper's skill as an advocate is so uncommon, his style so racy and picturesque, and his enthusiasm for his doctrine so contagious, that (*if he is read apart from his authorities*) one feels that Chaucer *should* have done this, even if he *didn't*. It is a necessary, even though an ungrateful task, to view Mr. Tupper's "many-hued theme" in dryer light.

<sup>8</sup> *Journal*, p. 565.

## I

The thesis with which we are concerned is that of an "architectonic use of the *motif* of the Deadly Sins" in the *Canterbury Tales*.<sup>1</sup> This treatment of the Sins is "not casual but organic,"<sup>2</sup> and it is "as a convenient and suggestive device of construction" that Chaucer uses it.<sup>3</sup> The "device of the Sins apparently came to the poet late,"<sup>4</sup> and with the *Parson's Tale* "Chaucer's treatment of the Sins *motif* is already complete," since "all the Sins are presented by precept and example."<sup>5</sup> The Tales involved are those of the Physician (exemplifying Lechery), the Pardoner (Avarice and Gluttony), the Second Nun (Sloth), the Wife of Bath (Pride), the Manciple (Wrath), the Man of Law (Envy), and the Summoner-Friar group (Wrath). The argument, as applied to each Tale, rests, (1) on the adequacy of the stories as *exempla* of the Sins, as this is established by their use in Gower or elsewhere, or by their aptness;<sup>6</sup> (2) on the fact that "each of the stories [is] accompanied by a parchment against the Sin in question";<sup>7</sup> (3) on the further fact that "with delightfully suggestive irony [Chaucer] oppose[s] practice to precept, rule of life to dogma, by making several of the story-tellers incarnate the very Sins that they explicitly condemn";<sup>8</sup> while (4) "the crowning argument for Chaucer's deliberate use

<sup>1</sup> *Journal*, p. 553; cf. *Publications*, p. 97.

<sup>2</sup> *Publications*, p. 96.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>4</sup> *Publications*, p. 117; cf. the whole paragraph.

<sup>5</sup> *Publications*, p. 125, text, and note 56.

<sup>6</sup> *Publications*, pp. 100, 111, 128.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 100 ff.; cf. also p. 107.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 107.

of the Sins *motif* in the Tales under discussion [is] the close connection between these and Chaucer's own detailed discussion of the Sins in his tract on the Deadly Seven which forms so large a part of the Parson's sermon.”<sup>9</sup> Such, briefly, are the main outlines of Mr. Tupper's argument.

I have, however, in my statement, greatly simplified the matter at one point. And it is that point which first concerns us. The seven (or eight) Tales just mentioned do not, as Tupper states his case, exemplify outright their respective Sins. The embodiment is *indirect*, through branches, concrete faults, or antitypes. Thus, the *Physician's Tale* represents Lechery, through its antitype Chastity; the *Second Nun's Tale*, Sloth, through its branch, Idleness, the antitype of Undevotion (another branch), and a more general antitype, “bisinesse”; the *Wife of Bath's Tale*, Pride, both directly, and through its branch Inobedience; the *Manciple's Tale*, Wrath, through its branch Chiding; and the *Man of Law's Tale*, Envy, through the fault of “Grucching” against Poverty, and the branches Sorrow at other men's weal, and Detraction. The only Tales which, as Tupper states them, exemplify a Sin *directly* are the Pardoner's (Avarice and Gluttony) and the Friar-Summoner group (Wrath). But in both cases this simplicity is only seeming. For in the *Pardoner's Tale* everything turns (as we shall see) upon the identification of the Sin of which Hazardry and Blasphemy are to be regarded as branches, while in the *Friar's Tale* it is Wrath in its branch of Cursing that is involved. In a word, we have to do with the *branches* of the Sins, as a series of indexes or exponents of the Sins themselves, and Mr. Tupper's uniform assumption is that “every man of

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 114.

the Middle Ages must have recognized at once " the Sin by its exponent.<sup>10</sup> This brings us to the first factor in the theory that gives us pause. For in this assumption lies a very grave difficulty, which the articles in question greatly minimize. Were Mr. Tupper's statements that follow quite in accordance with the facts, this difficulty might not be so serious. But the postulates of his entire argument have to do with the relation of the branches of the Sins to the main categories, and these postulates<sup>11</sup> demand the closest scrutiny. I shall first, then, deal with certain general considerations involved in these preliminary assumptions.

The Vices, we are told, unsystematized at first, " were afterwards adapted to rigid categories, and acquired phases and features which soon became stereotyped." <sup>12</sup> " More formal even than the sequence of the Sins are the traits assigned to each . . . Only voluminous reading in the literature of the Sins will enable one to distinguish readily all the branches and twigs of the deadly tree . . . [But] generally the limits of variation are so definitely fixed that an exemplum of the Sins, even though its title or tag be lacking, can be referred easily to its appropriate head by the discriminating student of the old formula." <sup>13</sup> Mr. Tupper grants that there are exceptions. " It is true that the formula of the Sins is not so fixed as to forbid all variations from its categories, but these varia-

<sup>10</sup> From the various forms in which the categories of the Sins were embodied, " every mediæval reader gleaned as intimate a knowledge of the Sins as of his Paternoster and his Creed, and hence was able to respond to every reference to these, explicit or implicit?" (*Publications*, p. 93). The italics are mine. Unless it is otherwise stated, that will uniformly be the case.

<sup>11</sup> *Publications*, pp. 93-96.

<sup>12</sup> *Publications*, p. 93.

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 94-96.

tions soon become traditional and cause little confusion."<sup>14</sup> I wish that I could exercise the same unfaltering confidence in the powers of the mediæval mind. But the facts that immediately follow stand seriously in my way.

For it becomes necessary to see just what these supposedly rigid and clear-cut categories really were, and I have the somewhat dismal task of presenting a summary of their intricacies. No statement will serve my purpose, for I do not care to set one statement over against another. The Middle Ages must for the moment speak for themselves. I shall use, as I have said, only the sources on which Mr. Tupper himself has drawn, and I shall temper completeness with mercy by omitting many of these.<sup>15</sup> There follow, as compactly as I can put them, the Sins with their branches, subheads, and "speces," as they appear in the *Parson's Tale*, the *Mirour de l'Omme*, the *Confessio Amantis*, the *Ayenbite of Invit*, and *Jacob's Well*.<sup>16</sup> To promote rapid survey, I shall italicize those branches or twigs which are common to two or more Sins.

#### PARSON'S TALE.

**Pride:** *Inobedience*, Vaunting, *Hypocrisy*, *Despite*, Arrogance, Impudence, Swelling of Heart, Insolence, Elation, *Impatience*, *Strife*, Contumacy, *Presumption*,

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 95.

<sup>15</sup> Among them, the accounts in *Piers Plowman*, the *Pèlerinage, Handlyng Synne*, the *Cursor Mundi*, Frère Lorens, Peraldus, etc. These omissions, it may be remarked, are all in Mr. Tupper's favor. Every additional classification thus analyzed strengthens the case against the assumed rigidity of the categories—as any reader so inclined may easily demonstrate for himself.

<sup>16</sup> Even so, I am omitting in almost every instance numerous "privée speces," some of which are no less ubiquitous than the major branches. I am also omitting, at this point, all but general references. My lists can easily be verified, for they follow in each case the order of treatment. The full references would double the space required.

Irreverence, Pertinacity, *Vain Glory, Jangling*—“ and many another twig.”

**Envy:** Sorrow at other men’s good, Joy at other men’s harm, *Backbiting or Detraction* (five “ species”), “ *Grucching* ” or *Murmuration*, arising from *Impatience, Avarice, Pride, Envy (Despite)*, or *Ire* (resulting in *Rancor, Bitterness, Discord, Scorning, Accusing, Malignity*).

**Wrath:** *Hate, Discord, War, Homicide* (including *Hate, Backbiting, Wicked Counsel, Lechery, Hazardry, Anger, Swearing, Adjuration and Conjuration, Divining, Charms, Lying, Flattery, Cursing, Chiding and Reproach, Scorning, Wicked Counsel, Discord, Double Tongue, Betrayal of Counsel, Menace, Idle Words, Jangling, Japing*).

**Sloth:** Dread to begin good works, *Despair, Somnolence, Negligence, Idleness, Tarditas, Lachesse, Undevotion, Tristitia*.

**Avarice:** Covetousness, Hard Lordships, Deceit between merchant and merchant, *Simony, Hazardry, False Witness, Theft, Sacrilege*.

**Gluttony:** Drunkenness, Troubling of Spirit, Devouring of Meat, Distemper, *Forgetfulness*.

**Lechery:** *Adultery, Fornication, Deflowering—and the long list of varieties of Adultery.*

#### MIROUR DE L’OMME.<sup>17</sup>

**Pride:** *Hypocrisy, Vain Glory [Fool Emprise (1357), Flattery (1372)], Overweening [Presumption (1526), Vain Curiosity (1611), Derision (1635), Malapertness (1683)], Vaunting, Inobedience [Despite (2152), Disdain (2257), Danger (2305), “ Grucching ” (2313), Murmuring (2323), Rebellion*

<sup>17</sup> The subheads of each main branch are given in brackets after their respective branches. Since there are no rubrics in the *Mirour* for any but the major subdivisions, I have included in parenthesis, in this case, the line-numbers for the “ twigs.”

(2325), Contumacy (2326), Perverseness (2403), *Contradiction* (2404), *Blasphemy* (2438)].

**Envy:** Detraction [Evil Tongue (2679), *Defamation*, (2906), Vituperation (2967), *Reproof* (2989)], Sorrow for others' Joy, Joy for others' Sorrow, Supplantation [*Ambition* (3398), Circumvention (3401), Confusion (3433)], *False-Seeming* [*Double Tongue* (3529), *False-Thinking* (3651), Dissimulation (3658)].

**Wrath:** Melancholy [Offense (3952), *Impatience* (3953), Irritation (3975), Provocation (3985)], Contention [*Mocking* (4273), *Slander* (4292), *Defamation* (4292), "Inquietacioun" (4299)], Hatred [Malice (4502), *Malignity* (4502), Rancor (4575), Ill-Will (4575)], *Strife* [*Mutilation* (4706), Fool-Haste (4741)], *Homicide* [*Menace* (4841), Terror (4843), Fright (4843), Murder (4863), *Cruelty* (4983), Vengeance (4993)].

**Sloth:** Somnolence [Tendressee (5305)], Indolence [Vain Belief (5429), Cowardice (5462), Inconstancy (5462), Desire (5463), Pusillanimity (5463)], Slackness [Sadness (5708), Obstinacy (5732), *Despair* (5761)], Idleness, Negligence (6072).

**Avarice:** Covetousness [*Accusation* (6315, 6325 ff.), Subtlety (6316, 6373 ff.), Perjury (6318, 6409 ff.), Trickery (6319, 6506 ff.), *Ingratitude* (6320, 6589 ff.), False Occasion (6351), Guile (6380), Plotting (6389), Cunning (6390), *Lying* (6495), Treachery (6506), *Deceit* (6507), Falsity (6408), Fraud (6544), Evil Device (6544), Conspiracy (6566), Confederation (6569), "Champartie" (6571), Circumvention (6578), Brokerage (6579)], Rapine [Robbery (6927), *Theft*, (6929, 7021 ff.), *Sacrilege* (6932, 7141 ff.)], Usury [Subtlety (7309), False Contrivance (7309), Evil Device (7310)], Simony, Niggardliness.

**Gluttony:** Voracity, Delicacy, Drunkenness, Superfluity, *Prodigality* [*Extortion* (8438)].

**Lechery:** Fornication, Rape, *Adultery*, Incest, Wantonness.

CONFESSIO AMANTIS.<sup>18</sup>

**Pride:** *Hypocrisy, Inobedience* [*Murmur, Complaint*], *Presumption, Vaunting, Vain Glory*—antitype, Humility.

**Envy:** Sorrow for others' Joy, Joy for others' Grief, *Detraction, False Semblant, Supplantation*—antitypes, Charity, Pity.

**Wrath:** Melancholy, *Cheste, Hate, Contek* [Foolhaste], *Homicide*, War—antitypes, Patience, Mercy.

**Sloth:** Lachesce, Pusillanimity, *Forgetfulness, Negligence, Idleness, Somnolence, Tristesce*—antitype, Prowess (including Gentilesse).

**Avarice:** Covetousness, *False Witness, Perjury, Usury, Parsimony, Ingratitude, Ravine, Robbery* (including the treatment of Virginity), Stealth, *Sacrilege*—antitype, Liberality.

**Gluttony:** Drunkenness, Delicacy.

[**Lechery:**] Incest (not otherwise directly treated).

AYENBITE OF INWYT.<sup>19</sup>

**Pride:** Untruth [Foulhood or *Ingratitude*, Madness or Folly, *Apostasy* (17-19)], *Despite* [not praising, honoring, or *obeying aright* (19-21)], Arrogance or Overweening [Singularity, *Prodigality, False Strife, Boasting, Scorn, Opposition* (21-22)], *Ambition* [*Flattery, Simulation, Slander, Deceit, Evil Counsel, Conspiracy, Strife*—“and uele ofre zennes” (22-23)], Idle-bliss or *Vain-Glory* [in goods of nature, of fortune, of grace (23-25)], *Hypocrisy* [+ *Avarice and Malice* (25-26)], Fool-dread, Fool-shame (26).

<sup>18</sup> I have given no references in the case of the *Confessio*. They may be easily found in Macaulay's analysis, *Works of John Gower*, II, pp. xxxiii-lxxxix.

<sup>19</sup> Ed. Morris (E. E. T. S.), pp. 16 ff. The numerals in parenthesis are the page-numbers.

**Envie:** Sorrow in other men's Joy, False-deeming, Wick-ed Gladness, Worse Sorrow, *Cursing* (27), *Bitterness*, Treachery (28), Sins against the Holy Ghost [*Pre-sumption*, *Despair*, Hardness of Heart, Contempt of Penance, Striving against Grace, Warring against Truth (28-29)].

**Hate (=Wrath):** Against one's self [Suicide (29-30)]; against God ["*Grucching*," *Blasphemy*]; against others [*Chiding*, *Wrath*, *Strife*, Desire of Vengeance, *Manslaughter*, War (30)].

**Sloth:** Slackness, Timidity ("Arʒnesse"), Tenderness, Idleness [*Ribaldry*, *Lechery*], Heaviness, Wickedness (31), Untruth, Dread, *Forgetfulness* (32), Slackness, Weariness (33), *Unbuxomness*, *Impatience* (33), "Grucching," Sorrow, Desire of Death, *Despair* (34).

**Avarice:** Usury [seven varieties (35-37)], *Theft* [four varieties, including *Adultery* and Wicked Judges (37-38)], Robbery [six varieties (38-39)], False Claim (Challenge) [seven varieties, including *False Witness*, *False Judges* and *Counsellors* (39-40)], *Sacrilege* [seven varieties (40-41)], *Simony* [six varieties (41-42)], Wickedness [*Apostasy*, "Grucching," *Treason*, *Discord*, False Accusation, etc. (43-44)], Chaffer [seven varieties (44-45)], Wicked Crafts, Wicked Games [*Dicing*, *Lying*, *Blasphemy* (45-46)].

**Lechery:** *Adultery* [fourteen kinds (46-50)].

**Sin of the Mouth:** i) **Gluttony:** Eating before time (50-51) [*Evil Games* (52)], Immoderate Eating and Drinking (52-53), *Hypocrisy* (53), Strong Yearning for Meat (55), *Extravagance* [*Vain Glory* (55)], Undue Anxiety about Eating [three varieties (55-56)]; *Lechery* (56); "Sins of the Tavern" [Gluttony, *Lechery*, *Swearing*, *Forswearing*, *Lying*, *Slander*, *Apostasy*, *Dispute*, *Cheste*, *Strife*, *Manslaughter*, *Theft* (56-57)]; ii) **Sins of the Tongue:** Idle Words [five sorts, including *Ribaldry*, *Mocking*, *Scorn*, *Manslaughter* (58)], Boasting [five sorts (58-60)], *Flattery* [five boughs (60-61)], *Detraction* [five sorts (61-62)], *Lying* [three sorts, with Guile and *Contek* (62-63)].

63)], *Perjury* and *Swearing* [seven modes of Swearing, including *False Witness* (63-65)], *Cheste* [*Strife, Chiding, Evil Speaking, Slander, Reproach, Threatening, Discord* (65-67)], “*Grucching*” [*Murmuring* a) against God, including “*Grucching*” against *Poverty*, b) against man—as a result of *Inobedience, Sloth, Impatience, Envy, or Felony* (67-68)], Opposition (68-69), *Blasphemy* (70).

#### JACOB'S WELL.<sup>20</sup>

**Pride:** *Presumption* [Singularity, Extravagance, Litigiousness, Avaunting, *Scorn, Anger* (70-71)], *Vain Glory* [three sorts (71)], *Unbuxomness* [*Despite, Disdain, Defiance* (71-72)], *Boldness* [*Unkindness, Wasting Time, Apostasy*—four kinds (72-73)], *Hypocrisy* [three kinds (73-74)], *Disdain* (76), *Impudence* [two kinds (77)], *Sturdiness* (77).

**Envys:** False Deeming, Sorrow at others' Good (82), *Slander, Bitterness, Backbiting, Sowing of Discord* (83), Restraining good beginnings, ruining him who would do right, and discrediting a good name (84); Sins against the Holy Ghost [*Presumption, Despair, Hardness of Heart, Contempt of Penance, Opposition to Grace, Opposition to Truth* (85)].

**Wrath:** *Hate, Malice* (90, 92), Vengeance, Wrath against God [“*Grucching*”], against one's self, against one's household (91) or one's neighbor, Hastiness, *Man-slaughter* [*Defamation* (93)], *Impatience* [“*Grucching*”], *Blasphemy* (94), *Sowing of Discord, Scorn* (99).

**Sloth:** “*Slugness*” (103-04), Tenderness (104-05), Idleness [*Hazardry, Tavern-revels, Dancing, etc.* (105-106)], Heaviness of Heart, Wickedness of Heart, “*Arweness*” (106), Delay of Amendment (107), Recklessness or Negligence (108), *Forgetfulness, Faintheartedness, Lachesce, Slackness* (109), *Inobedience, Impatience, “Grucching,” Heaviness, Langour, Despair* (112).

<sup>20</sup> Ed. Brandeis (E. E. T. S.), pp. 68 ff.

**Avarice:** Idolatry, *Ambition* (120), Niggardliness (121), *Treason* (122), Usury [twelve kinds (122-24)], Simony (126-27), *Theft* [five kinds (128)], Robbery [six kinds (129)], *Sacrilege* [eight kinds, including *Adultery* (130)], False litigation (130), Wickedness [*Apostasy*, Witchcraft, *Charms* (131), *Conjurations*, *Manslaughter*, *Sowing of Discord* (132)], Dishonest Trade [five kinds (133)], Disreputable Crafts [Prostitutes, Jugglers, Sham Cripples, "Lacchedrawers," *Japers*, Heralds-at-arms, Champions, Dishonest Tollers, Hangmen (134)], *Gambling* [nine divisions, including *Blasphemy* and *Inobedience* (135)].

**Gluttony:** Eating and drinking out of time or out of measure [including *Hypocrisy* (142-43)], Eating greedily, Eating over-dainty meats, Delicacy [*Vain Glory* (144), Distemper, in *Jangling*, *Boasting*, *Drunkenness*, *Tavern-revels*, *Swearing*, *Lying*, *Chiding*, *Despising*, *Cursing* (145)]; "Sins of the Tavern" [Gluttony, *Lechery*, *Forswearing*, *Slander*, *Backbiting*, *Scorn*, *Chiding*, *Despite*, *Apostasy*, *Theft*, *Robbery*, *Strife*, *Manslaughter* (148)]; Sins of the Tongue [*Idle-talk*, *Jangling* (148), *Boasting*, *Flattery* (149), *Backbiting* (150), *Lying* (151), *Forswearing*—seven kinds (152-53), *Chiding and Striving*—seven kinds, including *Disdain*, *Slander*, *Reproof*, *Menace*, *Discord* (154)], "Grucching" [a) against God, including "Grucching" against *Poverty*, b) against man (154-55)], *Frowardness* (155), *Blasphemy* (156).

**Lechery:** fourteen degrees (160-62).

These, then, are a few of the facts about the "rigid" categories. If we are going to be mediæval, let us be it, à toute outrance!<sup>21</sup>

<sup>21</sup> The interweavings of the *antitypes* of the Sins yield little in interest to the overlappings of the Sins themselves, and since Mr. Tupper deals also in antitypes, their inclusion would be highly pertinent. But space is not available. In the *Parson's Tale* the *remedia*

One thing is obvious at a glance. The "definitely fixed limits of variation" among the branches, which Mr. Tupper postulates,<sup>22</sup> simply do not exist. The maze that I have in part reproduced is, both in fact and *ex hypothesi*, what the mediæval reader had. No simplification of the facts is possible, unless we renounce once for all the mediæval point of view. Yet Mr. Tupper sweepingly simplifies. "It is true that the formula of the Sins is not so fixed as to forbid all variations from its categories, *but these variations soon become traditional and cause little confusion.*"<sup>23</sup> And he proceeds to illustrate the "limits of variation." "For instance, Swearing or 'Great Oaths' is usually classed under the head of Wrath, and yet in Langland more than once it is transferred to Gluttony both as a fault of the mouth and as a feature of tavern-revel. So, too, Chiding as a Sin of the Tongue, is sometimes found apart, as in the *Ayenbite* and *Mireour du Monde*, from its category of Wrath. Poverty finds a place under both Pride and Envy, and occasionally under Avarice; yet here there are obvious distinctions in the point of view."<sup>24</sup> *That is all.* The list of three variations which Tupper gives is utterly (however unintentionally) misleading, and the impression thus produced is peculiarly unfortunate. For the point involved is one which is absolutely vital to his argument. The relative fixity of the categories—which is the inevitable

follow their respective Sins. See especially Eilers, pp. 567 ff. In the *Mirour de l'Omme* each branch of each Sin has its corresponding antitype. See the long series beginning with l. 10177. The chief antitypes for the *Confessio Amantis* are given above. For the *Ayenbite* see ed. Morris, pp. 130 ff. (summarized in the Introduction, pp. xciv ff.). For *Jacob's Well*, see ed. Brandeis, pp. 238 ff. For one or two concrete instances, see below, pp. 300, n. 74; 327 ff.; 347, n. 21.

<sup>22</sup> *Publications*, p. 96.

<sup>23</sup> *Publications*, p. 95.

<sup>24</sup> *Publications*, pp. 95-96.

implication of his brief enumeration of exceptions, as well as something which he explicitly asserts—is fundamental to his further assumption of the immediate and accurate convertibility (in the minds of mediæval readers) of branches in terms of head Sins.<sup>25</sup> Unless the branches *have* these fixed associations, so that they may be intelligibly employed as the constant indexes or exponents of a given Vice, the theory falls to the ground. The slightest scrutiny of the partial summary given above affords ample evidence that branch after branch<sup>26</sup> moves hither and thither among the categories in a fashion which defies all definite assignment to this Sin or that. Mr. Tupper's list of three traditional variations would be the better for a supplement. Here is one which, like his, does not even approach completeness, but which is sufficient for our purposes.<sup>27</sup>

*Discord* appears under Pride,<sup>28</sup> Wrath,<sup>29</sup> Envy,<sup>30</sup> Avarice,<sup>31</sup> and Gluttony (Sins of the Tongue);<sup>32</sup> *Scorning*, under Wrath,<sup>33</sup> Envy,<sup>34</sup> Pride,<sup>35</sup> Sloth,<sup>36</sup> and Gluttony

<sup>25</sup> I am not exaggerating Mr. Tupper's position. See *Publications*, p. 93, ll. 8 ff.; p. 96, ll. 5 ff.; *Journal*, p. 555, ¶ 2, ll. 5 ff., etc.

<sup>26</sup> Including seven out of the ten on which Mr. Tupper bases his argument—Inobedience, Chiding, "Gruuching" against Poverty, Detraction, Hazardry, Blasphemy, Cursing.

<sup>27</sup> At the risk of the charge of pedantry, I shall give in this article, so far as possible, the reference for every statement of fact that I make. I am challenging assertions, and I wish my own to be susceptible of immediate verification.

<sup>28</sup> *Cursor Mundi*, l. 27604; *Pélerinage*, l. 14070; Raymund of Pennaforte (Petersen, *Sources of the Parson's Tale*, p. 27).

<sup>29</sup> I, 563 (§ 35), 640 (§ 45); *Jacob's Well*, p. 99.

<sup>30</sup> I, 510; *Cursor Mundi*, l. 28174.

<sup>31</sup> *Ayenbite*, p. 43; *Jacob's Well*, p. 132.

<sup>32</sup> *Ayenbite*, pp. 66-67.

<sup>33</sup> I, 635 (§ 43); *Jacob's Well*, p. 99.

<sup>34</sup> I, 510.

<sup>35</sup> *Ayenbite*, p. 22; *Jacob's Well*, p. 70; *Handlyng Synne*, p. 109; *Piers Plowman*, C. vii, 22 ff., B. xiii, 277.

<sup>36</sup> *Jacob's Well*, p. 105.

(Sins of the Tongue);<sup>37</sup> *Lyng*, under Wrath,<sup>38</sup> Avarice,<sup>39</sup> Pride,<sup>40</sup> Lechery,<sup>41</sup> Sloth,<sup>42</sup> and Gluttony (both independently<sup>43</sup> and as a Sin of the Tongue<sup>44</sup>); *Despite*, under Pride,<sup>45</sup> Envy,<sup>46</sup> Gluttony,<sup>47</sup> and Wrath;<sup>48</sup> *Jangling*, under Pride,<sup>49</sup> Wrath,<sup>50</sup> Gluttony,<sup>51</sup> and Avarice;<sup>52</sup> *Japing*, under Wrath,<sup>53</sup> Avarice,<sup>54</sup> Gluttony,<sup>55</sup> Sloth,<sup>56</sup> and Lechery;<sup>57</sup> *Flattery*, under Wrath,<sup>58</sup> Pride,<sup>59</sup> and Gluttony<sup>60</sup> (Sins of the Tongue); *Charms and Divining*, under Wrath,<sup>61</sup> Avarice,<sup>62</sup> and Sloth;<sup>63</sup> *Prodigality*, under Pride,<sup>64</sup> Gluttony,<sup>65</sup> and the Vice opposite to Avarice;<sup>66</sup> *Despair*, under Sloth,<sup>67</sup> Envy,<sup>68</sup> and Lechery;<sup>69</sup>

<sup>37</sup> *Ayenbite*, p. 58.

<sup>38</sup> I, 607 (§ 39).

<sup>39</sup> *Mirour*, ll. 6495 ff.; *Ayenbite*, p. 45; *Pelerinage*, ll. 18175 ff.; *Cursor Mundi*, l. 27833.

<sup>40</sup> *Piers Plowman*, B. XIII, 288; *Handlyng Synne*, p. 125.

<sup>41</sup> *Cursor Mundi*, l. 27924.

<sup>42</sup> *Jacob's Well*, p. 113.

<sup>43</sup> *Jacob's Well*, p. 145.

<sup>44</sup> *Ayenbite*, pp. 62-63; *Jacob's Well*, p. 151.

<sup>45</sup> I, 390; etc.

<sup>46</sup> I, 505.

<sup>47</sup> *Jacob's Well*, p. 145.

<sup>48</sup> *Pelerinage*, ll. 15680 ff.; *Jacob's Well*, p. 100.

<sup>49</sup> I, 405; *Ayenbite*, p. 20; *Cursor Mundi*, ll. 27620-22.

<sup>50</sup> I, 648.

<sup>51</sup> *Piers Plowman*, B. II, 94; *Jacob's Well*, pp. 145, 148.

<sup>52</sup> *Mirour*, l. 6286.

<sup>53</sup> *Piers Plowman*, B. II, 94.

<sup>54</sup> I, 650.

<sup>55</sup> *Jacob's Well*, p. 113.

<sup>56</sup> *Jacob's Well*, p. 134.

<sup>57</sup> *Piers Plowman*, B. XIII, 353.

<sup>58</sup> I, 610-15 (§ 40).

<sup>59</sup> *Mirour*, ll. 1369 ff.; *Pelerinage*, ll. 14644 ff.; *Ayenbite*, p. 23; *Handlyng Synne*, p. 121.

<sup>60</sup> *Ayenbite*, pp. 60-61; *Jacob's Well*, p. 149.

<sup>61</sup> I, 602-605 (§§ 37-38).

<sup>62</sup> *Jacob's Well*, pp. 131-32.

<sup>63</sup> *Cursor Mundi*, l. 28311.

<sup>64</sup> *Ayenbite*, p. 21; *Jacob's Well*, p. 70.

<sup>65</sup> *Mirour*, ll. 8401 ff.; *Ayenbite*, p. 55.

<sup>66</sup> *Confessio*, v, 7644-45.

<sup>67</sup> I, 692 (§ 56); *Pelerinage*, ll. 13932 ff.; *Handlyng Synne*, p. 170; etc.

<sup>68</sup> *Ayenbite*, p. 29; *Jacob's Well*, p. 85.

<sup>69</sup> Raymund of Pennaforte (Petersen, p. 27); *Mirror of St. Edmund*, p. 24.

*Anger*, under Wrath,<sup>70</sup> Pride,<sup>71</sup> and Sloth;<sup>72</sup> *Ambition*, under Pride,<sup>73</sup> Avarice,<sup>74</sup> and Envy;<sup>75</sup> *Adultery*, under Lechery<sup>76</sup> and Avarice;<sup>77</sup> *Hypocrisy*, under Pride,<sup>78</sup> Gluttony,<sup>79</sup> and Sloth;<sup>80</sup> *Treason*, under Avarice,<sup>81</sup> Envy,<sup>82</sup> and Pride;<sup>83</sup> *Menace*, under Pride,<sup>84</sup> Wrath,<sup>85</sup> and Lechery;<sup>86</sup> *Slander*, under Wrath,<sup>87</sup> Envy,<sup>88</sup> Sloth,<sup>89</sup> and Gluttony<sup>90</sup> (Sins of the Tongue); *Malignity*, under Envy,<sup>91</sup> Avarice,<sup>92</sup> and Wrath;<sup>93</sup> *Cursing*, under Wrath,<sup>94</sup> Envy,<sup>95</sup> and Gluttony;<sup>96</sup> *Vain Glory*, under Pride<sup>97</sup> and Gluttony;<sup>98</sup> *Forgetfulness*, under Sloth<sup>99</sup> and Gluttony;<sup>100</sup> *Accusation*, under Envy<sup>101</sup> and Avarice;<sup>102</sup> *Apostasy*, under Avarice<sup>103</sup> and Pride;<sup>104</sup> *Homicide*, under

<sup>70</sup> I, 582.<sup>71</sup> *Jacob's Well*, p. 70.<sup>72</sup> *Gaytryge's Sermon* (E. E. T. S., 26), p. 13.<sup>73</sup> *Ayenbite*, p. 22.<sup>74</sup> *Jacob's Well*, p. 120.<sup>75</sup> I, § 75; etc.<sup>76</sup> *Jacob's Well*, p. 130; *Ayenbite*, p. 37; cf. *Confessio*, v, ll. 6135 ff.<sup>77</sup> I, 390; *Mirour*, ll. 1057 ff.; *Pèlerinage*, ll. 14588; *Handlyng Synne*, pp. 110 ff.<sup>78</sup> *Ayenbite*, p. 53; *Jacob's Well*, p. 143.<sup>79</sup> *Pèlerinage*, ll. 13921 ff.<sup>80</sup> *Ayenbite*, p. 43; *Jacob's Well*, p. 122; *Cursor Mundi*, l. 27824.<sup>81</sup> *Pèlerinage*, ll. 14982-15232; *Handlyng Synne*, pp. 142-43.<sup>82</sup> Frère Lorens (Eilers, in "Essays on Chaucer"—Chaucer Soc.—Pt. v, p. 511); *Handlyng Synne*, p. 125.<sup>83</sup> *Handlyng Synne*, p. 126.<sup>84</sup> *Mirour*, l. 4841.<sup>85</sup> *Cursor Mundi*, l. 28517.<sup>86</sup> *Mirour*, l. 4292; *Jacob's Well*, p. 93; *Gaytryge*, p. 12.<sup>87</sup> *Jacob's Well*, p. 83; *Mirour*, ll. 2906 ff.<sup>88</sup> *Jacob's Well*, p. 113.<sup>89</sup> I, § 41.<sup>90</sup> *Ayenbite*, p. 66.<sup>91</sup> *Ayenbite*, p. 27.<sup>92</sup> I, 510.<sup>93</sup> *Jacob's Well*, p. 145.<sup>94</sup> Frère Lorens (Eilers, p. 543). <sup>95</sup> I, 390; etc.<sup>96</sup> *Mirour*, l. 4502.<sup>97</sup> *Jacob's Well*, p. 144; *Ayenbite*, p. 55.<sup>98</sup> *Ayenbite*, p. 32; *Jacob's Well*, p. 109; *Confessio*, iv, 539-886.<sup>99</sup> I, 825.<sup>100</sup> I, 510.<sup>101</sup> *Mirour*, l. 6315.<sup>102</sup> *Ayenbite*, p. 43; *Jacob's Well*, p. 131.<sup>103</sup> *Ayenbite*, p. 19; *Jacob's Well*, p. 73.

Wrath<sup>105</sup> and Avarice; <sup>106</sup> *Cruelty*, under Wrath<sup>107</sup> and Pride; <sup>108</sup> *False Semblance*, under Avarice<sup>109</sup> and Envy; <sup>110</sup> *Betraying of Counsel*, under Pride<sup>111</sup> and Wrath; <sup>112</sup> *Mocking*, under Avarice<sup>113</sup> and Wrath; <sup>114</sup> *Extortion*, under Avarice<sup>115</sup> and Gluttony; <sup>116</sup> *False Witness*, under Avarice<sup>117</sup> and Envy; <sup>118</sup> *Hate*, under Wrath<sup>119</sup> and Envy; <sup>120</sup> *Evil Counsel*, under Pride,<sup>121</sup> Wrath,<sup>122</sup> and Sloth; <sup>123</sup> *Frowardness*, under Pride,<sup>124</sup> Sloth,<sup>125</sup> and Gluttony<sup>126</sup> (Sins of the Tongue); *Conspiracy*, under Avarice<sup>127</sup> and Envy<sup>128</sup>; *Presumption*, under Pride<sup>129</sup> and Sloth; <sup>130</sup> *Sacrilege*, under Avarice<sup>131</sup> and Lechery; <sup>132</sup> *Double Tongue*, under Wrath<sup>133</sup> and Envy; <sup>134</sup> *Ingratitude*, under Pride<sup>135</sup> and Avarice; <sup>136</sup> *Strife*, under Wrath<sup>137</sup> and Pride; <sup>138</sup> *Perjury*,

<sup>105</sup> I, 564; etc.

<sup>106</sup> *Jacob's Well*, p. 132; *Cursor Mundi*, l. 27838.

<sup>107</sup> *Mirour*, ll. 4983 ff.; etc.

<sup>108</sup> *Pèlerinage*, ll. 14192 ff.

<sup>109</sup> *Pèlerinage*, ll. 17879 ff.

<sup>110</sup> *Mirour*, ll. 3469 ff.; *Confessio*, II, 1879 ff.

<sup>111</sup> *Handlyng Synne*, p. 125.

<sup>112</sup> *Handlyng Synne*, p. 196.

<sup>112</sup> I, 645, (§ 47).

<sup>114</sup> *Mirour*, ll. 4273 ff.

<sup>115</sup> I, 750 ff.; *Ayenbite*, pp. 38-39; *Jacob's Well*, p. 129.

<sup>116</sup> *Handlyng Synne*, pp. 218-19; *Mirour*, ll. 8438 ff.

<sup>117</sup> I, 795; *Ayenbite*, pp. 39, 44; *Jacob's Well*, p. 131; *Piers Plowman*, B. XIII, 359; *Confessio*, v, 2863.

<sup>118</sup> *Piers Plowman*, B. v, 89.

<sup>119</sup> I, § 35; etc.

<sup>120</sup> Raymund of Pennaforte (Petersen, p. 27); *Gaytryge*, p. 12.

<sup>121</sup> Frère Lorens (Eilers, p. 511); *Ayenbite*, p. 23.

<sup>122</sup> I, 566, 637.

<sup>123</sup> *Jacob's Well*, p. 105.

<sup>130</sup> *Cursor Mundi*, ll. 27800, 28358-59.

<sup>124</sup> *Cursor Mundi*, l. 27617.

<sup>131</sup> I, 800; etc.

<sup>125</sup> *Cursor Mundi*, l. 28252.

<sup>132</sup> *Cursor Mundi*, l. 27946.

<sup>126</sup> *Jacob's Well*, p. 155.

<sup>133</sup> I, § 46.

<sup>127</sup> *Mirour*, l. 6566.

<sup>134</sup> *Mirour*, ll. 3529, 3580, 3599, etc.

<sup>128</sup> *Cursor Mundi*, l. 27662.

<sup>135</sup> *Ayenbite*, p. 18.

<sup>129</sup> I, 390; etc.

<sup>136</sup> *Confessio*, v, 4887 (see gloss).

<sup>137</sup> *Mirour*, l. 4633; *Ayenbite*, p. 30.

<sup>138</sup> *Ayenbite*, p. 22.

under Avarice<sup>139</sup> and Gluttony; <sup>140</sup> *Ribaldry*, under Pride,<sup>147</sup> Sloth,<sup>142</sup> and Gluttony.<sup>143</sup>

The branches that definitely link themselves with Mr. Tupper's argument I shall consider later. Here it is sufficient to note that *Inobedience* (Unbuxomness) appears under Pride, Sloth, Avarice, and Gluttony (Sins of the Tongue), and through its antitype Obedience, under Lechery, Wrath, and Envy; *Detraction*, under Pride, Envy, Wrath, and Gluttony (Sins of the Tongue); “*Grucching*” or *Murmuration*, under Envy, Pride, Wrath, Sloth, Avarice, and Gluttony (Sins of the Tongue); *Hazardry*, under Wrath, Avarice, Sloth, and Gluttony; *Blasphemy*, under Wrath, Pride, Avarice, and Gluttony (Sins of the Tongue); *Chiding*, under Wrath, Pride, Envy, Gluttony, and Sins of the Tongue; *Cursing*, under Wrath, Envy, and Gluttony; *Impatience*, under Wrath, Pride, Envy, and Sloth.—Is it true, as Professor Tupper states, that “these variations soon become traditional and cause little confusion”? Could the mediæval reader, even though he were “a discriminating student of the old formula”<sup>144</sup> (which he probably was not), refer any one of a score or two of branches—not to speak of an *exemplum* without its tag—easily to its appropriate head?

The truth, of course, is that the categories of the Seven Deadly Sins are neither “rigid,” nor “stereotyped,” nor “strict.” They overlapped and interwove, and the same specific Sin appears now in this group, now in that. That is one salient fact. But there is still another—a mediæval phenomenon of no small significance, which Mr. Tupper has also totally overlooked. For “*summae* and sermons, ‘mirrors’ and manuals, hymns, ‘moralities,’ books

<sup>139</sup> *Confessio*, v, 2866.

<sup>142</sup> *Jacob's Well*, p. 113.

<sup>140</sup> *Jacob's Well*, p. 153.

<sup>143</sup> *Piers Plowman*, C. vii, 435.

<sup>141</sup> *Handlyng Synne*, p. 126.

<sup>144</sup> *Publications*, p. 96.

of *exempla*, rules of nuns and instructions of parish priests, catechisms of lay folk and popular penitentials, such famous allegories as De Guileville's *Pèlerinage*<sup>145</sup>—not to speak of Dante, and Langland, and Gower, and Spenser—all show a surprising lack of Mr. Tupper's faith in the mediæval reader's powers of divination. One and all, *they employ the most explicit rubrics, titles, headings*, to designate their groups and “place” their branches, so that the wayfaring man, though mediæval, should not err therein.<sup>146</sup> It could not have been otherwise. When Mr. Tupper insists that titles or tags were unnecessary, he is running counter to one of the most striking facts that characterize the mediæval treatment of the Sins—the constant and explicit indication of a given Sin's provenience at the moment among the categories. For a given fault belonged to the Sin where, at the moment, it was *put*. Without explicit indication, the position of scores of faults (and even branches) among the categories was indeterminate. If Mr. Tupper does not feel that, the Middle Ages did, and they consistently guarded against the confusion inherent in the nebulous boundaries between Sin and Sin. Whatever else may be true of the method of dealing with the Sins which Mr. Tupper finds in Chaucer, it is at least unmediæval. And to prove up to the hilt the exemplification in a tale of a given *branch* may be still to leave the question of the *Sin* exemplified an absolutely open one.

Nor is the reason for this state of things far to seek. As Professor Manly has pointed out, “in the Middle

<sup>145</sup> *Publications*, p. 93.

<sup>146</sup> Spenser, for example, drew freely on the branches for the traits which he combined in his portraits of the Sins (see these *Publications*, xxix, pp. 410 ff.)—but each portrait was *named*. Dante's method is also explicit.

Ages the Seven Sins were treated as tempers or tendencies out of which particular misdeeds grow. And, naturally, the same deed, the same sin, may originate in any one of several different tempers or tendencies.”<sup>147</sup> One need go no farther than the *Parson's Tale* for evidence. “And as wel comth Ire of Pryde, as of Envy; for soothly, he that is proude or envious is lightly wrooth.”<sup>148</sup> “In this forseyde develes fourneys there forgen three shrewes: Pryde, that ay bloweth and encreseth the fyr by chydinge and wikked wordes. Thanne stant Envy, and holdeth the hote iren upon the herte of man with a peire of longe tonges of long rancour. And thanne stant the sinne of contumelie or stryf and cheeste, and batereth and forgeth by vileyngs reprevinges.”<sup>149</sup> “Envy and Ire maken bitternesse in herte; which bitternesse is moder of Accidie.”<sup>150</sup> “After Glotonye, thanne comth Lecherie; for thise two sinnes been so ny cosins, that ofte tyme they wol not departe.”<sup>151</sup> Nor could a better concrete illustration be given than one which the Parson himself provides. “Grucching or murmuracioun” (I, 497-514) is given as a branch of *Envie*. “Somtyme it springeth of *inpacienc*e”—and Impatience is the Parson's tenth twig of *Pride*. “Somtyme comth grucching of *avarice* . . . Somtyme comth murmure of *Pryde* . . . And somtyme grucching sourdeth of *Envye* . . . and [they] grucche, and murmure prively for verray *despyt* . . . Som tyme grucching comth of *ire* or *prive hate*, that norisseth *rancour* in herte . . . Thanne cometh eek *bitternesse* of herte . . . Thanne cometh *discord* . . . Thanne comth *scorninge* . . . Thanne comth *accusinge* . . . Thanne

<sup>147</sup> *Modern Philology*, vii, p. 115. This statement is quoted (*Modern Language Review*, v, p. 19) with assent by R. W. Chambers, whose mediævalism Mr. Tupper accepts.

<sup>148</sup> I, § 32 (*de Ira*).

<sup>149</sup> I, § 34 (*de Ira*).

<sup>150</sup> I, § 53 (*de Accidia*).

<sup>151</sup> I, § 74 (*de Luxuria*).

comth *malignitee*"—and in the section under Wrath, hate, discord, and scorning are duly given as branches of that Sin. The *confusion* of the categories is, to say the least, as essential a fact as their *rigidity*. The simplification of the complexity inherent in the very conception of the Sins is not a mediæval, but a modern point of view.

In a word, the premises of Mr. Tupper's argument are large assumptions. The simplification which he postulates is unwarranted by the facts.<sup>152</sup> It "necessitates"—if I may quote—"not only a disregard of all evidence but an insensibility to the trend of mediaeval thought."<sup>153</sup> Yet on that simplification the whole structure rests. I shall come to that in a moment in detail. Meantime there is one other general consideration that appears from even a cursory reading of the summaries that I have given.

The range of the categories is practically all-inclusive. If one is to tell tales at all, one is foredoomed to run into them. If there is any story involving human sin or frailty (or its opposite—for there are the antitypes) that could not qualify as an *exemplum* of some branch or other of the Seven Deadly Sins, such a story would rival "the soleyn fenix of Arabye." Nor is it necessary to go far

<sup>152</sup> I have preferred in this discussion to present at first hand the facts as they lie in Mr. Tupper's own sources, without referring to the work of others. But anyone who wishes a judgment that carries the weight of absolute authority may turn to the chapter on "Classification of Sins" in Lea's *History of Auricular Confession and Indulgences in the Latin Church*, Vol. II, chap. xx, pp. 233-284 (especially pp. 238-44), for statements far stronger than mine regarding the labyrinth of the Sins. For there was not only the immeasurable complication of the branches, but the still further practical impossibility of laying down rules to determine whether a given fault was even Deadly Sin at all.

<sup>153</sup> *Publications*, p. 105. Mr. Tupper has just been speaking of Chaucer's close adherence "to the strict categories of human errors recognized by all his contemporaries."

afield for the evidence. The *exemplum*-books are full of it, but I shall come nearer home. Let us take the stories that Chaucer told (or meant to tell) in his "Seintes Legende of Cupyde." What happened to them at the hands of Gower? Pyramus and Thisbe exemplify *Wrath*, under its branch of Contek;<sup>154</sup> Dido and Æneas, *Sloth* (Lachesse);<sup>155</sup> Medea and Jason, *Avarice* (Perjury);<sup>156</sup> Lucretia (on Mr. Tupper's principle),<sup>157</sup> *Lechery*, under its antitype of Chastity;<sup>158</sup> Theseus and Ariadne, *Avarice* (Ingratitude);<sup>159</sup> Philomela and Tereus, *Avarice* (Ravine);<sup>160</sup> Demophon and Phyllis, *Sloth* (Forgetfulness).<sup>161</sup> Of the tales which Chaucer names but does not tell, Ulysses and Penelope exemplify *Sloth* (Lachesse);<sup>162</sup> Tristram and Isolde, *Gluttony* ([Love-]Drunkenness);<sup>163</sup> Paris and Helen, *Avarice* (Sacrilege);<sup>164</sup> Canace and Machaire, *Wrath* (Melancholy);<sup>165</sup> Deianira and Nessus, *Envy* (False-Semblant);<sup>166</sup> and as for Ceix and Alceone (to round out the Man of Law's list), they illustrate *Sloth* (Somnolence).<sup>167</sup> But does even Mr. Tupper for a moment suppose that these old and distinguished stories stood for these Sins in the minds of mediaeval readers *apart from Gower's explicit labelling of them as they entered into the framework of his poem?*<sup>168</sup> Would the man of the Middle Ages have so "placed"

<sup>154</sup> *Confessio Amantis*, III, 1331 ff.

<sup>155</sup> IV, 77 ff.

<sup>157</sup> See below, pp. 306 ff.

<sup>156</sup> V, 3247 ff.

<sup>158</sup> VII, 4754 ff.

<sup>159</sup> V, 5231 ff.

<sup>160</sup> V, 551 ff. In *Purgatorio*, xvii, 19 ff., Philomela (or Progne) is an example of *Wrath*.

<sup>161</sup> IV, 731 ff.

<sup>165</sup> III, 143 ff.

<sup>162</sup> IV, 147 ff.

<sup>166</sup> II, 2145 ff.

<sup>163</sup> VI, 467 ff.

<sup>167</sup> IV, 2927.

<sup>164</sup> V, 7195 ff.

<sup>168</sup> It is unnecessary to remark that Chaucer himself did not regard them as "Sins Tales."

them, without their tag?<sup>169</sup> They are simply “impressed soldiers” (as Dr. Mosher has well put it)<sup>170</sup> in Gower’s army, and few of the myriads of mediæval tales were free from liability to such conscription. The “aptness” of a story to exemplify a Vice<sup>171</sup> counts for little, for (once given the all-embracing compass of the Seven Deadly Sins, their branches, and their antitypes, and the branches of their antitypes) the story would be far to seek that was *not* potentially a “Sins Tale.” Nor does the fact that a story was once so used thereby create for it a Deadly Sins tradition. Dido, Medea, Pyramus and Thisbe, and the rest appear and reappear, after Gower as before, with no trace of the confessional upon them.<sup>172</sup> Neither “aptness” nor previous use may be given too much weight.<sup>173</sup>

These are general considerations. In the light of them let us examine the details of Mr. Tupper’s argument.

## II

I shall consider first the Tales that are not common to Chaucer and Gower—namely, the *Pardoner’s Tale*, the Friar-Summoner Group, and the *Second Nun’s Tale*.

The *Pardoner’s Tale*, to which Mr. Tupper has de-

<sup>169</sup> I hope I may not be thought so unfair to Mr. Tupper’s argument as to imply that the case of the *Legend* stories is parallel *at all points* with the case, as he states it, for the *Canterbury Tales* in question. I am concerned, for the moment, solely with “the adequacy of . . . stories as *exempla* of the Sins” (*Publications*, p. 100).

<sup>170</sup> *The Exemplum in England* (Columbia University Press, 1911), p. 126.

<sup>171</sup> *Publications*, p. 111.

<sup>172</sup> See, for example, *Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, VIII, pp. 546-65.

<sup>173</sup> See below, pp. 304-05.

voted a separate article,<sup>1</sup> is apparently his strongest card among the three. For the Pardoner stands, *ex hypothesi*, for Avarice and Gluttony. He tells a tale which may be—and sometimes is—construed as an *exemplum* against Avarice. He himself is avaricious, and he preaches (as he is the first to tell us) against the very vice which he practices. He also inveighs against Gluttony, and is himself no ascetic. And (as in accordance with the argument he should) he draws upon the *Parson's Tale*. None of this, to be sure (except the heightening of the tavern-setting), is new; the superb irony of prologue, sermon, tale, and epilogue has long been recognised.<sup>2</sup> What is new is the contention that “the rascal is *formally illustrating [the] Deadly Sins*” of Avarice and Gluttony,<sup>3</sup> as his contribution to Chaucer's architectonic use of the *Sins motif*. And it is Avarice and Gluttony alone (it must be noted) for which he stands, for “in his exposition of [these] two Sins . . . there is little opportunity for any intrusion of other elements.”<sup>4</sup> The Pardoner, then, according to the theory, exemplifies two Sins only—Avarice and Gluttony. Let us look for a moment at Mr. Tupper's problem.

The Pardoner starts out with the account of his stock sermon against *Avarice*. Incidentally he mentions, as homiletic motives, Flattery, Hypocrisy, Vain Glory (all branches of *Pride*), and Hate (a branch of *Wrath*).<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Journal*, pp. 553-565. Compare *Publications*, pp. 98, 105, 107-08, 115, 124.

<sup>2</sup> See, for example, *The Atlantic Monthly*, LXXII, pp. 829 ff.

<sup>3</sup> *Publications*, p. 115.

<sup>4</sup> *Publications*, p. 124. In the article on “The Pardoner's Tavern” the conception of Gluttony is expanded to “Sins of the Tavern” (*Journal*, p. 559); there is “evidence of the strongest that the Pardoner is exemplifying *only* the vices of the tavern” (*Journal*, p. 558).

<sup>5</sup> C, 409-11.

After a passing glance at his own *lecherous* proclivities,<sup>6</sup> he comes to his "moral tale"—an "ensample" (such as "lewed peple loven"),<sup>7</sup> "which," he distinctly says, "*I am wont to preche, for to winne*" (461). It is one of his own sermons, accordingly, such as he has just described, which he proposes to rehearse. The *exemplum* has its setting in a tavern (463-82),<sup>8</sup> and in the vivid preliminary account of the tavern-revels, *Hazardry* (465, 467), *Gluttony* (468), *Blasphemy* (472-75), and *Lechery* (481-82) all find a place. Having mentioned these Sins, the Pardoner "falls into the well-worn *exempla* track" (for it is his well-worn sermon that he is preaching), and proceeds to take them up in order, and to deal with them in true *exemplum* fashion—first *Lechery* (483-89) and *Homicide* (488-97)<sup>9</sup> as the result of *Drunkenness*; then *Gluttony* in general (498-548), with its subhead *Drunkenness* in particular (549-88). Having finished with *Gluttony* he comes to *Hazardry* (590-628), especially as it applies to those in high estate (595-628). *Hazardry* disposed of, he proceeds to *Blasphemy* (629-60)—reverting at the close to the "bicched bones two," whose fruit is "Forswearing, *ire*, falsnesse, *homicyde*" (657). Then follows the *exemplum*, which pays its respects to *Drunkenness* (705), *Blasphemy* (708-09), and *Hazardry* (751), in its course toward its climax, *Homicide*, as the result of *Avarice*. Thereupon we have the peroration:

<sup>6</sup> C, 453.

<sup>7</sup> C, 435-37.

<sup>8</sup> It may well have had this setting in Chaucer's source, as Mr. Tupper (following Miss Petersen, *On the Sources of the Nonne Prestes Tale*, pp. 98-100) hints (*Publications*, p. 98, n. 8). The headings which Miss Petersen quotes, however, do not include "de Gula."

<sup>9</sup> With this paragraph compare particularly the *Summoner's Tale*, D, 2043-78; see below, p. 281.

O cursed sinne, ful of cursednesse!  
 O traytours *homicyde*, o wikkednesse!  
 O glotonye, *luxurie*, and *hasardrye*!  
 Thou *blasphemour* of Crist with *vileinye*  
 And *othes grete*, of usage and of *pryde!*<sup>10</sup>

And then the Pardoner ends orderly where he began:

Now, goode men, god forgeve yow your trespass,  
 And ware yow fro *the sinne of avaryce*.<sup>11</sup>

Here is “goddes foysone” of the Seven Deadly Sins! <sup>12</sup> *Avarice*, *Gluttony*, *Lechery*, *Wrath*, *Pride*—five of the Seven—specifically named; three branches of *Pride* (*Flattery*, *Hypocrisy*, *Vain Glory*) and two of *Wrath* (*Hate*, *Homicide*) referred to; and *Hazardry* and *Blasphemy* given each its own special and (so far as Chaucer tells us) independent place. Mr. Tupper’s problem is to reduce all this to *two* sole Sins. For the Pardoner stands in his scheme for *Avarice* and *Gluttony* alone. How does he solve it?

He does it, in the first place, by dropping the pilot. The close connection between the Tales concerned and the Parson’s sermon is, as we have seen, “the crowning argument for Chaucer’s deliberate use of the Sins motif.” And in the present instance it is “*the large plunderings of the Pardoner* from the Parson’s reflections on *Avarice* and *Gluttony* and its auxiliary vices” that “betoken . . . that the rascal is *formally illustrating* those Deadly Sins.”<sup>13</sup> The argument from the *Parson’s Tale*, then,

<sup>10</sup> C, 895-99.

<sup>11</sup> C, 904-05.

<sup>12</sup> I need scarcely say that I have no quarrel with the view that Chaucer knew the Seven Deadly Sins and made superbly artistic use of the material that they afforded him. It is from a *schematizing* of them, which stands in sharp conflict with the facts and with itself, that I dissent.

<sup>13</sup> *Publications*, pp. 114-15.

applies both in general and in particular to the *Pardoner's Tale*. But "the large plunderings of the Pardoner" are not only from Mr. Tupper's two Sins, Avarice and Gluttony; they are even more largely from the Parson's discourse on *Wrath*.<sup>14</sup> That is inconvenient, for even to allow one Tale to represent two Sins is stretching a point; to make it the representative of *three*, by including *Wrath*, would be for the theory a fatal embarrassment of riches. This Mr. Tupper evidently sees. "*It is true*," he says, "that in the *Parson's Tale*, Hazardry is included under Avarice [he fails to state that it is also included under *Wrath*; see I, 580] ... and Great Oaths under *Wrath*; *but*,"<sup>15</sup> etc. Again: "*It is interesting* that the Parson, like Peraldus, includes Hazardry under Avarice and Great Oaths under *Wrath*. This arrangement, *however*,"<sup>16</sup> etc. It is both true and interesting, and it is also of vital moment to the validity of Mr. Tupper's reasoning. The *Parson's Tale* is the "crowning argument"—till it runs counter to the theory; then, "farewell feldefare"! If Mr. Tupper's thesis is to be accepted, it must be on the basis of his evidence. And it is playing fast and loose with evidence to assert on one page that the Pardoner's borrowings from the Parson show that he is illustrating Avarice and *Gluttony*, and then to announce on another that it is "interesting" that the very points on which most stress is laid belong in the *Parson's Tale* to Avarice and *Wrath*.

And to *Wrath* the Pardoner's "plunderings" undoubtedly belong in large degree. It is under *Wrath* that the Parson's long discourse on *Blasphemy* is found (I,

<sup>14</sup> See below, pp. 264-67.

<sup>15</sup> *Publications*, p. 105, n. 26.

<sup>16</sup> *Journal*, p. 562. I shall consider the "but" and the "however" below.

587 ff.). And the greater part of what the Pardoner says of "othes false and grete"<sup>17</sup> is drawn directly from the section "de Ira" of the *Parson's Tale*.<sup>18</sup> Moreover, Chaucer here (as Professor Tupper does not point out)<sup>19</sup> is in accord with the *Ayenbite*,<sup>20</sup> Raymund of Pennaforte,<sup>21</sup> Frère Lorens,<sup>22</sup> the *Cursor Mundi*,<sup>23</sup> Gaytryge's Sermon,<sup>24</sup> and *Jacob's Well*.<sup>25</sup> Even Hazardry, in connection with Blasphemy, is brought in the latter directly under Wrath.<sup>26</sup> Furthermore (and this too Mr. Tupper does not note), the Pardoner's shoulder-bone of a sheep with its use as a charm for curing animals (and even men) comes also from the *Parson's Tale*, under Wrath.<sup>27</sup> Yet the Pardoner's exposition is "of the two Sins of Avarice and Gluttony." "There is little opportunity," we are told, "for any intrusion of other elements." But Wrath, unlike "the many-hued theme of Love,"<sup>28</sup> is scarcely an intrusion—except upon the necessity of avoiding identification of the Pardoner with too many Sins. The facts are clear. Blasphemy in the *Parson's Tale* is a branch of Wrath, and the Pardoner draws his discourse on Blasphemy largely from the *Parson's Tale*. On Mr. Tupper's

<sup>17</sup> C, 629 ff. The phrase "as olde booke trete" is immediately followed by actual quotation from the *Parson's Tale*.

<sup>18</sup> See Herrig's *Archiv*, LXXXVII, pp. 39-41 (and Skeat's notes) for the source of ll. 631-37, 648-50, and 472-75.

<sup>19</sup> He names only Peraldus.

<sup>20</sup> P. 30.

<sup>22</sup> L. 27736.

<sup>21</sup> Petersen, p. 27.

<sup>24</sup> P. 12.

<sup>22</sup> Eilers, pp. 525-28.

<sup>25</sup> Pp. 94-95.

<sup>23</sup> See on p. 100 the *exemplum* of the quarrelsome dicer and his blasphemy.

<sup>24</sup> I, § 37: "But lat us go now to thilke horrible swering of adjuacioun and conjuracioun, as . . . in a shulder-boon of a sheep." "Charmes for woundes or maladyes of men, or of bestes" is under belief in "divynailes" (§ 38). See C, 350-360, 361-71.

<sup>25</sup> *Publications*, p. 124.

own hypothesis, "every man of the Middle Ages must have recognized at once" that along with Avarice and Gluttony the Pardoner represented *Wrath*.<sup>29</sup> Yet Wrath finds no place in the schematizing of the character.

But that is not quite all. With an unconscious irony that Chaucer would have loved, Tupper has treasured up Wrath against the day of Wrath. For he must show that the *Summoner's Tale* draws on the Parson's sermon too. But in this case it is the section "De Ira" on which the Summoner *must* draw, since he exemplifies Wrath. Now the Summoner's borrowings from the Parson, as Mr. Tupper gives them, are these:

This every lewed viker or person<sup>30</sup>  
Can seye, how *Ire* engendreth *homicyde*.  
*Ire* is, in sooth, executour of *pryde*.<sup>31</sup>

Homicide and Pride, therefore, come under *Wrath*, and the fact that the Summoner in so declaring is drawing on the *Parson's Tale* is one of the arguments<sup>32</sup> advanced by Mr. Tupper to demonstrate that the Summoner stands for Wrath. But when the *Pardoner* asserts in his account of Blasphemy that the fruit of Hazardry is

*Forswering, ire, falsenesse, homicyde;*<sup>33</sup>

<sup>29</sup> Tupper has apparently forgotten, when he makes his statement in the *Journal* (p. 562) that "it is interesting that the *Parson*, like *Peraldus*, includes . . . Great Oaths under Wrath," that he has said in the *Publications* (p. 95): "Swearing or 'Great Oaths' is usually classed under the head of Wrath."

<sup>30</sup> *Videlicet*, "Every man of the Middlle Ages."

<sup>31</sup> D, 2008-10. This is the beginning of "the hundred-line homily against *Ire*" (*Publications*, p. 113), and both Tupper and Skeat refer the lines to I, 564 f., 534: "Of this cursed sinne of *Ire* cometh eek . . . *homicyde* . . . And as wel comth *Ire* of *Pryde*."

<sup>32</sup> No. 3, on p. 113 (*Publications*).

<sup>33</sup> C, 657.

when in his final summary he refers to “traytours homicyde . . .”

And othes grete, of usage and of *pryde*—<sup>34</sup>

*then we have* “an orderly exposition in the true *exemplum* manner of the two Deadly Sins illustrated by his story . . . first, cursed *Avarice*, that leads to homicide; then *Gluttony*.<sup>35</sup> What is sauce for the Summoner should be sauce (one would think) for the Pardoner. Finally, Mr. Tupper overlooks the fact that his argument from *irony* requires the inclusion of Wrath. No other of the Pilgrims is so angry as the Pardoner:

This pardoner answerde nat a word;  
So wrooth he was, no word ne wolde he seye.<sup>36</sup>

Like Brahma, Wrath might surely say: “They reckon ill who leave me out.”

What Mr. Tupper actually does, in order to escape the disastrous saddling of (at least) *three* Sins upon the Pardoner, is no less instructive. Blasphemy may not remain under *Wrath*, where his own insistence on the importance to his argument of the *Parson's Tale* has clearly put it. He is compelled to identify it with another Sin, *Gluttony*. And this brings it at once into close juxtaposition with Hazardry. “The two other accessories of Gluttony<sup>37</sup>—Hazardry and Blasphemy—are always closely associated in mediæval literature.”<sup>38</sup> But in the case of Hazardry

<sup>34</sup> C, 896, 899.

<sup>35</sup> *Journal*, p. 562.

<sup>36</sup> C, 956-57. He is far more angry than the Summoner, for *he* could speak. See D, 1665 ff.

<sup>37</sup> The third is *Lechery*. The same dire necessities of Mr. Tupper's argument that exclude Wrath forbid also that Lechery should be treated as an independent Sin. It is one, of course, in the categories.

<sup>38</sup> *Journal*, p. 560. They are commonly (but not “always”) associated with each other; they are by no means always, as we shall see, associated with *Gluttony*—which is all that counts.

Mr. Tupper once more runs counter to the *Parson's Tale*. For the Parson does not include Hazardry under Gluttony. "It is interesting that the Parson, like Peraldus, includes Hazardry under *Avarice*."<sup>39</sup> And again it is rather more than "interesting." For the *Pardoner* obviously includes it under *Avarice* too. In the first place, he distinguishes it from Gluttony as clearly as words can make distinctions:

And now that I have spoke of glotony,  
Now wol I yow defenden hasardrye.<sup>40</sup>

In the second place, he immediately proceeds, in the very next lines, to reproduce part of the *Parson's section upon Avarice*:

Hasard is verray moder of lesinges,  
And of deceite, and cursed forsweringes,  
Blaspheme of Crist, manslaughtre, and wast also  
Of catel and of tyme.<sup>41</sup>

Now comth hasardrye . . . of which comth deceite, false othes . . . blaspheminge and reneyinge of god . . . wast of godes, mispendinges of tyme, and somtyme manslaughtre.<sup>42</sup>

What becomes—I can only ask again—of the "crowning argument"? Either "the Parson's portrayal of the Vices . . . enters into the framework of the Sins Tales and makes obvious the 'application' of each,"<sup>43</sup> or it does

<sup>39</sup> *Journal*, p. 562.

<sup>40</sup> C, 589-90. In the *Pardoners* sermon Gluttony, Hazardry, and Blasphemy are co-ordinate heads (if clearly marked divisions mean anything). The last two are not (like Lechery) "annexed un-to glotony."

<sup>41</sup> C, 591-94.

<sup>42</sup> I, 793 (*De Avaricia*). See Herrig's *Archiv*, LXXXVII, p. 40. Mr. Tupper actually quotes this passage from the *Parson's Tale* (*Journal*, p. 562) as part of his justification of the assignment of Hazardry to *Gluttony*, without the slightest intimation of the fact that the Parson is discussing a branch of *Avarice*.

<sup>43</sup> *Publications*, p. 116. On the preceding page Mr. Tupper tells

not. So far as the *Pardoner's Tale* is concerned, Tupper's treatment of his climactic argument, in wresting Blasphemy from Wrath and Hazardry from Avarice, utterly vitiates his own contention.

Let us leave the relation of Hazardry and Blasphemy to the *Parson's Tale*, and consider Hazardry, for the moment, as it appears elsewhere. It is not only the *Parson* (like Peraldus) who includes it under Avarice. It is the tenth bough of Avarice in the *Ayenbite*,<sup>44</sup> where its treatment occupies over half a page, with two *exempla*.<sup>45</sup> It is the tenth bough of Avarice in Frère Lorens.<sup>46</sup> It is one of the ten branches of Avarice in *Jacob's Well*,<sup>47</sup> where it has nine divisions, including Blasphemy. And it is included under Avarice in the *Pèlerinage*.<sup>48</sup> The *Parson's Tale*, Peraldus, the *Ayenbite*, Frère Lorens, and *Jacob's Well*, that is, all class it definitely as one of the subheads of Avarice, and the *Pèlerinage* connects it with that Vice. Tupper cites three cases of its occurrence under *Gluttony*. "Both the *Ayenbite*, p. 52, and *Piers Plowman*, B. v, link Gluttony and games of chance."<sup>49</sup> And he compares a mention of "ludi inordinati et prohibiti" from a discussion (apparently) of "Gula" in Bromyard.<sup>50</sup> As for the *Ayenbite*, the case is not quite

us that "the conclusion is irresistible that such a borrowed treatment of each Sin is neither unconscious nor casual, but deliberately designed."

<sup>44</sup> Pp. 45-46.

<sup>45</sup> The *Ayenbite* is one of Mr. Tupper's witnesses for *Gluttony* (*Journal*, p. 561). See below, p. 270.

<sup>46</sup> Eilers, pp. 543, 548.

<sup>47</sup> Pp. 134-35. "þe thredde fote brede wose in coueytise is foly pley; þat is, at þe tabelys & at þe dyse," etc.

<sup>48</sup> Ll. 18426-30.

<sup>49</sup> *Publications*, p. 105, n. 26. This is introduced by the "but" referred to above (p. 264, n. 16). Compare *Journal*, pp. 561-62.

<sup>50</sup> *Ibid.*

as Mr. Tupper states it. For in "The Pardoner's Tavern" he is more explicit: "Hazardry . . . is one of the subheads of Gluttony in the *Ayenbite of Invit* (p. 52)." It is not a "subhead" at all—except of *Avarice*. It is mentioned on p. 52 as one of the "manye kueades" that men do ("ase playe at ches. ofer ate tables") under the first bough of Gluttony, which is "to ete beuore time" (p. 51). The "of'er boȝ" comes after the bare mention (in one line, as compared with the full treatment as a subhead under *Avarice*) of chess and tables. As for *Piers Plowman*, B. v, I am willing to waive the point, although I find in the passage no mention of what can fairly be called "games of chance."<sup>51</sup> The passage from Bromyard I cannot speak of at first hand. In any case, the weight of Tupper's own "rigid categories"<sup>52</sup> including his chief witness, the Parson—is against his classification. His own postulate is that "every mediæval reader gleaned [from such formulations] as intimate a knowledge of the Sins as of his Paternoster and his Creed, and hence was able to respond to every reference to these, explicit or implicit." If such a reader knew (and the whole argument rests on the assumption that he did) Per aldus, or the Parson, or Dan Michel, or Deguileville, or (later) *Jacob's Well*, would he at once recognize Haz-

<sup>51</sup> I suppose Mr. Tupper has in mind (he unfortunately gives no explicit reference) the "chaffare" in ll. 327-43. But on this see *Englische Studien*, v, p. 150. "Chaffare" (it may be remarked) is, as Mr. Chambers rightly points out, the eighth bough of *Avarice* in the *Ayenbite* (see *Modern Language Review*, v, p. 20). It is also included under *Avarice* in *Jacob's Well* (pp. 133-34) and *Piers Plowman* (B. XIII, 380). And as *Brocage* (with which, as Mr. Chambers notes, it is identical), it appears under *Avarice* in the *Mirour* (l. 6579). Compare especially *Mirour*, ll. 6283-85.

<sup>52</sup> In none of his authorities is Hazardry a branch of Gluttony, as in five it is of *Avarice*.

ardry as *Gluttony*? But the point is one that scarcely need be labored further.

We must, however, look at the matter from another (but still mediæval) point of view. Mr. Tupper has called three witnesses—the *Ayenbite*, *Piers Plowman*, and *Bromyard*—for Hazardry as associated with Gluttony. For Blasphemy as subordinate to Gluttony he cites *Piers Plowman*,<sup>53</sup> *Bromyard*,<sup>54</sup> and *Barclay*.<sup>55</sup> But now we are confronted in still another fashion with the vagaries of those “strict categories of human errors,” the strictness of which is the foundation stone of Mr. Tupper’s argument. We have seen that Hazardry appears under *Avarice* not only in the *Parson’s Tale*, but also in *Peraldus*, *Frère Lorens*, the *Ayenbite*, *Jacob’s Well*, and the *Pèlerinage*. But that is not all. It appears under *Sloth* in the *Cursor Mundi*,<sup>56</sup> the *Mirour de l’Omme*,<sup>57</sup> *Wyclif*,<sup>58</sup> and *Jacob’s Well*.<sup>59</sup> And it is included under *Wrath* (as well as under *Avarice*) not only in the *Parson’s Tale* itself,<sup>60</sup> but also in *Jacob’s Well*.<sup>61</sup> Blasphemy appears under *Wrath* not only in the *Parson’s Tale*, but also in the *Ayenbite*, *Raymund of Pennaforte*, *Frère Lorens*, *Gaytryge*, the *Cursor Mundi*, and *Jacob’s Well*.<sup>62</sup> It also appears under *Avarice* in the *Ayenbite*,<sup>63</sup> *Piers Plowman*,<sup>64</sup> the *Mirour*,<sup>65</sup> the *Pèlerinage*,<sup>66</sup> and *Jacob’s Well*.<sup>67</sup> And it is included under *Pride* in the *Cursor*

<sup>53</sup> *Publications*, p. 105, n. 26; *Journal*, p. 561 (“B, vi, 92” should read “B, ii, 92”).

<sup>54</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>60</sup> I, 580.

<sup>55</sup> *Journal*, p. 561.

<sup>61</sup> P. 100 (*exemplum*).

<sup>56</sup> L. 28338.

<sup>62</sup> See above, p. 265.

<sup>57</sup> L. 5779.

<sup>63</sup> P. 45.

<sup>58</sup> Ed. Arnold, III, p. 145.

<sup>64</sup> B. XIII, 383.

<sup>59</sup> P. 105, l. 13.

<sup>65</sup> Ll. 6433 ff.

<sup>66</sup> Ll. 18176 ff.

<sup>60</sup> P. 135. It is also included under Sins of the Tongue (Gluttony) on pp. 153, 156.

*Mundi*<sup>68</sup> and the *Mirour*.<sup>69</sup> Hazardry and Blasphemy, that is, are classed as branches (in each case) of at least three Sins besides Gluttony. Moreover, Mr. Tupper's own illustrations are peculiarly unfortunate.<sup>70</sup> The very first—that of the unlucky dicer who loses his eye as the result of his blasphemy—appears in the *Ayenbite*<sup>71</sup> under *Avarice* (Wicked Games). The *exemplum* on p. 624 of Herbert, *Catalogue of Romances*, has the heading: “*De iracundia et blasphemis et periuriis et inuidia superne gracie*”; the others in the list have no headings whatsoever, so far as Herbert indicates. The stanzas immediately preceding the quotation from Barclay's “Of card players and dysers” have much to say of *Wrath*, but nothing of *Gluttony*.<sup>72</sup> Barclay's “Of Blasphemers and sweres” lays stress on *Envy*.<sup>73</sup> The only one of the Seven Deadly Sins with which Hazardry and Blasphemy are *not* directly associated in the authorities

<sup>68</sup> Ll. 27608-15.

<sup>69</sup> Ll. 2437 ff.

<sup>70</sup> *Journal*, pp. 560-62. He is illustrating the fact that Hazardry and Blasphemy “are always closely associated in mediæval literature.” Their association *with each other* (it must be said again) is a familiar commonplace—in life as in the categories (see, for instance, *Romanic Review*, II, pp. 116-17). It is only examples of their association with *Gluttony* that are relevant to Mr. Tupper's argument.

<sup>71</sup> P. 45.

<sup>72</sup> Exces of watchyng doth players great damage  
And in that space oft Venus doth them blynde . . .  
Also this game troubleth oft theyr mynde  
With *wrath* them makyng vnstable as the wynde . . .  
A *couetous* herte by game is kept in fere  
And styrred to *yre* euer when it can nat wyn . . .  
And so the more that *wrath* doth hym inflame  
The more backwarde and lewdly goeth his game (II, 71).

Mr. Tupper's quotation is from the next stanza but one.

<sup>73</sup> See II, p. 130, stanzas 2-3.

which Mr. Tupper cites is Lechery. And Lechery in the argument is included under Gluttony. Out of these conflicting witnesses Mr. Tupper picks the ones that suit his theory. But what assurance has he that "the mediæval reader" would have hit on the same ones? Or, indeed, how can he tell that that convenient collective, resolved into its constituent individuals, might not have chosen very variously? Is it not possible that some among them might even have been faithful to the Parson? The truth of course is that, *without some tag*, no mortal, however preternaturally mediæval, *could* refer a given branch "easily to its appropriate head." And in the case of the *Pardoner's Tale* it is not "Chaucer, temp. 1390," but that incorrigible modern, Mr. Tupper, who has confined the Pardoner within the pale of just two Sins, by deleting Wrath, and assigning to Hazardry and Blasphemy their place with Gluttony, rather than with Wrath, or Avarice, or Sloth, or Envy, or Pride.

I know that Tupper has taken final refuge in "the develes temple."<sup>74</sup> For his latest position is that the Pardoner's harangues "are directed against those vices which are ever associated with *taverns* in mediæval tradition."<sup>75</sup> And so, "in accounts of the Deadly Seven we find that Gluttony includes 'Sins of the Tavern,' and moreover that *these sins are the very vices enumerated by Chaucer.*"<sup>76</sup> It is true that they are, but they are also a

<sup>74</sup> See *Journal*, p. 562: "This arrangement, however [i. e., the Parson's interesting slip in his classification of Hazardry and Blasphemy], does not debar the poet, when fashioning the Pardoner, from combining Dicing and Swearing in the traditional conception of the Glutton as a lord of tavern revels and misrule rather than as a mere slave of food and drink."

<sup>75</sup> *Journal*, p. 557.

<sup>76</sup> *Journal*, p. 559. Why Mr. Tupper does not say "In *some* accounts," or even "In *three* accounts," I do not know. Among his

good deal more. Mr. Tupper cites the two tavern passages from the *Ayenbite* and *Jacob's Well*, and quotes them in part. But he does not quote the list of the "Sins of the Tavern" from either. In the *Ayenbite* it is as follows: "glotounye. lecherie. zuerie. uorzuerie. lyeȝe. miszigge. reneye god. euele telle. contacky. and to uele oþre manyeres of zennes. þer ariseþ þe cheastes. þe strifs. þe manslaȝþes. þer me tekþ to stele: and to hongi. þe tauerne is a dich to þieues."<sup>77</sup> That includes (besides Gluttony and Lechery) Wrath (in its branches of Contek, Cheste, Strife, Manslaughter—waiving Forswearing altogether), Avarice (as Theft), and Envy (as "miszigge") —and it does not include Hazardry. In *Jacob's Well* the list is: "glotonye, leccherye, for-sweryng, slaundryng, bakbyting, to scorne, to chyde, to dyspyse, to reneye god, to stele, to robbe, to fyȝte, to sle, & manye oþere swiche synnes. And þus he [the devil] heldyth hem be þe throte of glotonye in þe scolehous of his tauerne. *he techyfth his dyscyiples to mysgouerne here tungys*"<sup>78</sup>—and then follow immediately, as "Tavern Sins," the ten Sins of the Tongue: Idle-talk, Boasting, Flattery, Backbiting, Lying, Forswearing, Chiding and Striving, "Grueching," Frowardness, Blasphemy.<sup>79</sup> All the "Deadly Seven"

own authorities "Sins of the Tavern" are given explicit treatment as such in only the three which he names. And one of these (*Jacob's Well*) is in all probability a fifteenth-century document (ed. Brandeis, p. xiii).

<sup>77</sup> Pp. 56-57.

<sup>78</sup> P. 148.

<sup>79</sup> Pp. 148-156. The provenience of the Sins of the Tongue is made even more explicit at the close of the enumeration. "*Out of þis glotonye ... springeth out at þe mowth ofte, in þe feendys scolehous of þe tauerne, a tre, þat is, euyl tunge ... þe tre euyll tunge, þat springeth out of þe wose of glotonye, hath x. braunches, þat is, x. spycys, & iche of þo spycys hath many levis, þat is, many circumstaunceys*" (pp. 156-57).

(except perhaps Sloth) are there—once more without Hazardry.<sup>80</sup> The “Sins of the Tavern” are on the one hand vastly too inclusive; in one embarrassing particular, on the other hand, they scarcely include enough. Their wide inclusiveness, moreover, is obvious from another fact. The tavern appears in the categories themselves as the *locus* of other Sins than Gluttony. That is the case under *Pride*, in *Piers Plowman*;<sup>81</sup> under *Avarice*, in the *Mirour de l'Omme*;<sup>82</sup> under *Sloth*, in Wyclif<sup>83</sup> and *Jacob's Well*;<sup>84</sup> under *Youth*, the daughter of *Idleness*, in the *Pèlerinage*.<sup>85</sup> The tavern, in other words, is on precisely the same footing as the Tournament in *Handlyng Synne*, where (under Sloth) Mannyng turns aside, in a famous passage, to demonstrate that tournaments involve *all* the Seven Deadly Sins: “Of tournameintys y preue þerynne, Seuene poyntes of dedly synne.”<sup>86</sup> For the “Sins of the Tavern” are far less a formula than a rough sketch of the familiar facts of life. People eat and drink in taverns (that being precisely what they’re there for), often to excess. When (as a result) they are drunk, they are apt to grow lecherous. They also amuse

<sup>80</sup> Similarly, in the third example (*Ship of Fools*, I, 93) which Mr. Tupper gives (*Journal*, p. 560), Barclay (whose only direct reference to taverns in the whole passage is the line which Tupper quotes) adds to Gluttony and Lechery the following: Discord (p. 93), Murder, Theft (94), Wrath, Cruelty (95), Strife, Chiding, Blasphemy, Hazardry (96). The title of the section is “Of glotons and dronkardes.”

<sup>81</sup> C. vii, 50; B. xiii, 304.

<sup>82</sup> Ll. 6285, 6304.

<sup>83</sup> Ed. Arnold, III, p. 145.

<sup>84</sup> P. 105—where the point at issue is the leaving of “þi paryscherche & þi seruyse” for the tavern, precisely as in the case of *Gluttony* in *Piers Plowman* (B. v, 308-14).

<sup>85</sup> Ll. 11618 ff.

<sup>86</sup> Ll. 4573-74. The passage includes ll. 4571-4636.

themselves there in other ways—playing at dice for one—and when they play at dice they swear, and frequently grow angry, and sometimes kill. That is as much a fact today as it was “in mediæval tradition”—witness every morning’s paper. The use of a tavern and its revels as an apt and integral setting for a character is, *per se*, absolutely independent of any schematic relation whatsoever to the Seven Deadly Sins. Or would Mr. Tupper see a “Sins Character” in Falstaff? Chaucer has employed the tavern setting in a piece of matchless irony. But that irony needs no appeal to a categorizing of two Sins for its support.<sup>87</sup>

Is it not obvious that all this tanglement arises from a struggle to wrest a magnificent and free creation—a superb and complex masterpiece of ironical characterization, matched only by that of the Wife of Bath herself—into conformity with a schematic type? And an *impossible* schematic type at that, one has to add. For Chaucer himself has stated his own theme. The Pardoner’s declaration is explicit and reiterated:

My theme is alwey oon, and ever was—  
“*Radix malorum est Cupiditas*” . . .

<sup>87</sup> In a racy passage in “The Pardoner’s Tavern” Mr. Tupper insists (*Journal*, p. 564) that the pseudo-Chaucerian “Prologue of the Merry Adventure of the Pardoner with a Tapster at Canterbury” could not be derived from the Pardoner of the *General Prologue*, nor from “the hypocritical exponent of *Avarice* known to every reader,” but is, indeed, from “the *gluttonous* Pardoner of his prologue and tale,lickerish, lecherous, blasphemous”—and so on. This is trichotomy with a vengeance. Schematizing has now had its perfect work in the equation: Pardoner = General Prologue (neutral) + exponent of *Avarice* + exponent of *Gluttony*. What the *Tale of Beryn* does show is the fact that Chaucer’s mediæval contemporaries took his Pardoner not as a schematic figure, but as a man.

Therfor my theme is yet, and ever was—  
“*Radix malorum est cupiditas.*”<sup>88</sup>

And the Pardoner and his maker surely knew. The *theme* of the Tale is *Avarice*—and Avarice is “*radix malorum*.” If most of the other Seven Sins also come in, they have their warrant. Tupper’s *two* are either one too many or three or four too few. There is no alternative. To insist that “the Pardoner’s summary of sins in the application at the close of his tale (C, 895-99)<sup>89</sup> . . . is an orderly exposition in the true *exemplum* manner of the two Deadly Sins illustrated by his story and by his own practice and assailed in his sermon”<sup>90</sup>—so to insist comes perilously near “high-handed wresting of the evidence into accord with a preconceived verdict.”<sup>91</sup> That summary, as well as the other—“*Forswering, ire, falsnesse, homicyde*”—can not be brought under Avarice and Gluttony alone even by an appeal to the “Sins of the Tavern.” To do so, it is necessary to emulate the Glutton’s cooks—to “*stampe, and streyne, and grinde*” the twigs and branches, “and turnen substaunce in-to accident.”<sup>92</sup>

<sup>88</sup> C, 333-34, 425-26. And with the same text the Parson begins *his* sermon on the Vice (I, § 62).

<sup>89</sup> See above, p. 263.

<sup>90</sup> *Journal*, p. 562.

<sup>91</sup> *Publications of the Modern Language Association*, xxv, p. 179. These are Mr. Tupper’s own words regarding the members of the Bonn Seminar. I cannot but feel that, without in the least intending it, he has fallen into the same fallacy—against which, he remarks, “argument is impossible.”

<sup>92</sup> With Mr. Tupper’s statement about the Tale itself I should unreservedly agree, were it not for his “primarily”: “Nobody can doubt that the *Pardoner’s Tale* is primarily an *exemplum* of Avarice” (*Publications*, p. 98, n. 8). So far as Chaucer is concerned, we have the Pardoner’s text to guide us, and that is enough. But one could wish that Mr. Tupper had pointed out the fact that the story is not an *exemplum* of Avarice at all in a large number of its var-

## III

In the case of the Pardoner we have had one Tale as the exemplification of two Sins. In the Friar-Summoner group we have one Sin divided between two Tales. And precisely as in the *Pardoner's Tale* Mr. Tupper has deleted Wrath in the interest of Gluttony, so in the *Summoner's Tale* he suppresses Gluttony in the interest of Wrath. "That the *Summoner's Tale* is . . . directed against Wrath is indicated not only by the anger of poor Thomas and the boar-like frenzy of the friar, but by the hundred-line homily against Ire,<sup>1</sup> which is put into this same friar's mouth (D, 2005-2090)."<sup>2</sup> In this same friar's mouth, however, is also put a sixty-eight line sermon (to be precise) directed against Gluttony (D, 1873-1941). Its purport is unmistakable. It is a panegyric

iants. It is not so even in the Buddhist analogue, the 48th *Játaka*, which contains the remark about Avarice. See the "moral lesson"—the recoil of the plot upon the plotter—with which it concludes (*Originals and Analogues*, p. 422). The moral is the same in the third Arabian version (*ibid.*, p. 430; cf. the moral of the second, p. 429), and in the analogues from the *Libro di Novelle* ("cosi paga Domenedio li traditori," p. 133) and the *Morlini Novellae* ("Nouella indicat: nec esse de malo cogitandum: nam quod quis seminat, metit," p. 134). *Primarily*, the story is an *exemplum* of "this even-handed justice [which] Commends the ingredients of our poison'd chalice To our own lips." Its application to Avarice is *secondary*. Even the Pardoner does not make this application explicitly. It is implicit, however, not only in his text, but also in ll. 904-05. Incidentally, Mr. Tupper has incautiously followed Skeat's summary (*Oxford Chaucer*, III, p. 439) of the version from *Le Ciento Novelle Antike*. In the original Christ does not "warn his disciples against the fatal effects of Avarice," except by implication. See the text in *Originals and Analogues*, p. 131.

<sup>1</sup> This touch of rhetorical exaggeration (for the sermon has eighty-five lines) is perhaps not very important, but it happens to have some bearing upon the point at issue.

<sup>2</sup> *Publications*, p. 113.

on the abstinence of friars as contrasted with the ways of "burel folk," who live "in richesse and despence Of mete and drinke, and in hir foul delyt."<sup>3</sup> Nor does it merely inveigh against Gluttony by implication. It is entirely explicit:

Fro Paradys first, if I shal nat lye,  
Was man out chaced for his glotonye;  
And chaast was man in Paradys, certeyn.<sup>4</sup>

That is clear enough in its bearing, but happily we have other testimony too. Mr. Tupper has recently shown<sup>5</sup> that "all of the Scriptural *exempla* of fasting put into the mouth of the friar [in the *Summoner's Tale*] are taken directly from one or two chapters in the second book of the [famous tract of Jerome, 'Against Jovinian']"—although he passes over in absolute silence, in his discussion of the Friar-Summoner group,<sup>6</sup> the presence of these same significant *exempla*. On the three lines just quoted from the *Summoner's Tale*, however, he thus comments in his latest article: "It is significant that this very passage from Jerome *is used by the Pardoner in his attack upon Gluttony* (C, 508 f.). . . . This use of a common source in these two tales of the Sins is suggestive."<sup>7</sup> It is significant, and it is suggestive, for it proves irrefragably (if proof were needed) that the *friar's* first homily is directed against *Gluttony*, and "it seems surprising—if the oversights of Chaucer scholars can any longer awake surprise—that" Mr. Tupper failed to see the implications of his own very sound observation.

<sup>3</sup> D, 1874-76. Cf. ll. 1880, 1883, 1898-1900, 1907-08, etc.

<sup>4</sup> D, 1915-17.

<sup>5</sup> *Notes*, pp. 8-9. But see also *Modern Language Notes*, February, 1915, pp. 63-64.

<sup>6</sup> *Publications*, pp. 112-13.

<sup>7</sup> *Notes*, p. 9.

But the friar does not stop with these explicit lines. He is no less unambiguous later:

Fy on hir pompe and on hir glotonye! . . .  
 Me thinketh they ben lyk Jovinian,  
 Fat as a whale, and walkinge as a swan;  
 Al vinolent as botel in the spence.<sup>8</sup>

He is preaching, then, a sermon against Gluttony.<sup>9</sup> And as in the case of the *Friar's Tale* Chaucer "doubles the story's aptness" by the exquisite irony of the contrast between the homily and the friar's own hypocritical *Delicacie*:

'Now dame,' quod he, 'Je vous dy sanz doute,  
 Have I nat of a capon but the liver,  
 And of your softe breed nat but a shivere,  
 And after that a rosted pigges heed,  
 (But that I nolde no beest for me were deed),  
 Thanne hadde I with yow hoomly suffisaunce.  
 I am a man of litel sustenaunce.  
 My spirit hath his fostring in the Bible.'<sup>10</sup>

Indeed, he has *trebled* the aptness. For the Summoner himself, who tells the tale, is both a glutton and a lecher:

<sup>8</sup> D, 1927-31.

<sup>9</sup> Compare also with the friar's repeated emphasis on *abstinence and prayer* (e. g., ll. 1870-73, 1879, 1883-84, 1900, 1905, 1939) the Pardoner's statement (still under *Gluttony*):

. . . alle the sovereyn actes, dar I seye,  
 Of victories in th' olde testament,  
 Thurgh verray god that is omnipotent,  
 Were doon in *abstinence and in preyere*;  
 Loketh the Bible, and ther ye may it lere (C, 574-78).

The friar's sermon might well be an exposition of that text!

<sup>10</sup> D, 1838-45. This is at least as valid for the argument as Tupper's "boar-like frenzy of the friar," which is also in the Tale itself!

As hoot he was, and lecherous, as a sparwe . . .  
 Wel loved he garleek, oynons, and eek lekes,  
 And for to drinken strong wyn, reed as blood.  
 Than wolde he speke, and crye as he were wood . . .  
 He wolde suffre, for a quart of wyn,  
 A good felawe to have his concubyn  
 A twelf-month, and excuse him atte fulle.<sup>11</sup>

"With delightfully suggestive irony," then, in the friar's sermon against Gluttony Chaucer has "opposed practice to precept, rule of life to dogma, by making [the Summoner] incarnate the very Sin that [he] explicitly condemn[s]."<sup>12</sup> Even the "homily against *Ire*," moreover, includes *Gluttony* too. For the story of Cambyses (D, 2043-2078) is an *exemplum* against Drunkenness as well as Wrath.<sup>13</sup> Indeed (since Tupper has raised the point of numerical values), if we regard the thirty-five lines of the Cambyses *exemplum* as common to Gluttony and

<sup>11</sup> A, 626, 634-36, 649-51. The implications of his *disease* are patent to anyone who knows the significance in mediæval medicine of the remedies which Chaucer names.

<sup>12</sup> *Publications*, p. 107. The Summoner's Gluttony and Lechery that are the very essence of the man certainly constitute as valid evidence (still assuming Mr. Tupper's point of view) as the natural outbreak of Wrath after the Friar has told his tale.

<sup>13</sup> Irous Cambyses was eek *dronkelewe* . . .  
 A lord is lost, if he be vicious;  
 And *dronkenesse* is eek a foul record  
 Of any man, and namely in a lord . . .  
 For goddes love, *drink more attemprely*;  
*Wyn maketh man to lesen wrecchedly*  
*His minde, and eek his limes everichon* (2043-55).

With the last, compare the *Pardoner* on *Gluttony*:

*A lecherous thing is wyn* and *dronkenesse*  
*Is ful of stryving and of wrecchednesse . . .*  
*Thou fallest, as it were a stiked swyn . . .*  
*For dronkenesse is verray sepulture*  
*Of mannes wit* (C, 549-50, 556, 558-59).

Wrath, we have fifty lines devoted to Wrath alone as against sixty-eight devoted to Gluttony alone. But we need not chop logic about numbers. The homily against Gluttony is of at least equal weight with the homily against Wrath. Yet Mr. Tupper does not even mention it. An argument can scarcely be taken very seriously that deals in this fashion with the facts.

But the *Summoner's Tale* does not stand alone in Tupper's scheme. It forms a Wrath-group with the *Friar's Tale*. And Tupper gives two "potent reasons" for regarding this latter Tale as "an *exemplum* of Cursing (Wrath)." <sup>14</sup> The force of the first I frankly cannot see. How the notorious "strife between friars and *possessors or beneficed clergy*" that finds mention in Langland's illustration of Wrath (B. v, 136-52) furnishes "a wonderfully exact parallel to the angry quarrel between the Friar and the *Summoner*" is beyond my ken. Langland does not describe a quarrel <sup>15</sup> at all, and the Summoner is not a possessor. The second reason involves a rather glaring lapse into the use of the ambiguous middle. "The Friar's story of the nemesis of hell-pains brought upon a *cursing* summoner by the heart-felt *curses* of his intended victim exemplifies most accurately the section on *Cursing* in the Parson's discussion of Wrath (I, 618 f., § 41)." The two "cursings" are not the same thing at all. The first refers (as Tupper himself recognizes <sup>16</sup>) to the *archdeacon's curse*—that is, excommunication; the second and third are cursing in the sense of *malediction*. It is not

<sup>14</sup> *Publications*, pp. 112-13.

<sup>15</sup> That does come in, and vividly enough, in the following lines about the *nuns* (153-65).

<sup>16</sup> *Publications*, p. 113 top. But on p. 115 Mr. Tupper remarks that Chaucer "draws upon the Parson's discourse on Anger . . . for the exact motif of the Friar's tale of retribution."

the Summoner's *archidiaconal* curse that has "retorne[d] agayn to him that curseth," and the whole argument is a *non sequitur*. Moreover, Tupper's "poetic justice" of the return upon the offender of "swich cursinge as comth of irous herte" precisely reverses the point of the Tale. Can he have remembered Herolt's story of "the grasping [avarus]<sup>17</sup> lawyer" at all? The devil and the advocate meet a man leading a pig. The pig is refractory: "Cumque porcus hoc illucque diverteretur, iratus homo clamavit, 'Diabolus te habeat!'" The devil's reply to the advocate's suggestion is in substance the same as in the *Friar's Tale*. Then a mother says to her crying baby, "Diabolus te habeat!" The advocate again urges the devil to take what has been given him. But the devil replies: "Non mihi illum dedit ex corde: sed talis est consuetudo hominibus loquendi, cum irascuntur." It is only when the villagers, who know the advocate all too well, curse him "ex intimo corde" (not in mere sudden anger) that the devil carries off his prize.<sup>18</sup> Cursing from "irous herte" is just what does not, in the *Friar's Tale* as in Herolt, come home to roost. Nor is such cursing even deadly sin. Tupper asks us to compare *Handlyng Synne*, 3757 f. Let us do so, and read on four lines:

3yf a man curse as yn game,  
And yn hys herte wyl hym no shame<sup>19</sup>  
he ne synneh nat þan dedly,  
For hyt ys seyd al yn rybaudy.

---

<sup>17</sup> See below, p. 285, n. 27.

<sup>18</sup> See the story as printed for the Percy Society, Vol. VIII, pp. 70-71; *Originals and Analogues*, p. 106.

<sup>19</sup> Cf. D, 1567-68: "Heer may ye see, myn owne dere brother, The earl spak oo thing, but he thoghte another."

þis synne ys nat dampnable  
But hyt be seyd custummable.<sup>20</sup>

Either Mr. Tupper's understanding of the story or his interpretation of "irous cursing" is wrong. Both cannot be right. His argument for the *Friar's Tale* as "an *exemplum* of the Cursing phase of Wrath" falls to the ground.

It does so, I think, because Tupper has failed to look at Chaucer's story from the mediæval point of view. The situation which underlies the Tale *has* a perfectly definite association with the Seven Deadly Sins in Tupper's own authorities, but it is entirely different from the one he gives.<sup>21</sup> Let us take first a brief passage from Wyclif:

And þis [i. e., lechery among the poorer classes] is knownen to bischop clerkis, for þei spoylen hom in chapiters, as who wolde spoyle a thef; and by hor feyned sommenyng þei drawen hom fro hor laboure, to tyme þat þei have grauntid what silver þei shal paye; and þen by feyned cursyng þei maken hom paye þis robbing. . . . Lord, where slepis þis gode lawe, and when schal hit be wakened? Certis, not bifore coreytise of þese clerkes be quenchid.<sup>22</sup>

That is exactly the situation which Chaucer elaborates with such consummate art, and his emphasis, like Wyclif's,<sup>23</sup> is on the Summoner's *Avarice*.<sup>24</sup> But it is not

<sup>20</sup> Ll. 3761-66. So in the *Cursor Mundi* (28563) "wreth þat scort and soden es" is among the "smale sinnes" of which it "es no nede Ilkan for to reken and rede."

<sup>21</sup> Once more, I am assuming Mr. Tupper's premises for the nonce. I do not believe that Chaucer was schematizing at all.

<sup>22</sup> Ed. Arnold III, pp. 166-67.

<sup>23</sup> Compare also *The English Works of Wyclif* (ed. Matthew, E. E. T. S.), p. 35: "Lord, whi schulde curatis pronounsen here breþeren a cursed for nakid lettris of syche couetous prelatis"; p. 75: "Also whanne þei cursen for here couetise"; p. 95: "þes anticristis clerkis cursen men al day for money"; p. 150: "þei cursen here gostly children more for loue of worldly catel þan for brekyng

only Wyclif who so interprets the Summoner's cursing; it is also the "rigid categories" themselves. Under the fourth bough of Avarice in the *Ayenbite* are included "*þe ualse lettres*<sup>25</sup> uor to greui oþren. and trauayleþ þet uolk myd wrong. *oþer be cristene cort. oþer be leawede cort.*"<sup>26</sup> Under the seventh branch of Avarice in *Jacob's Well* occurs the following:

Offyeyallys and denys þat oftyn settyn chapetlys, to gaderyn þat þei may geten, þowȝ þei do wrong, þei recche neuere, for þei haue more affeccyoun to gadere syluer þan to don correccyoun, and þit þei do noȝt so scharpely reddour to ryche men as to pore, for ryche þey forbere for mede, & pore men þei greue wrongfully, *wyth cursynges* & putting out of cherch to penaunce, to paye vnryȝtfully. þis may be clepyd *raueyn & extorcyoun*. Also somnours & bedels, þat dwellyn in offyce vnder hem, spare no concyens to take what þei may getyn.<sup>27</sup>

And in the *Mirour de l'Omme Gower*, writing of "les Archedeacnes, Officials et Deans" administers a scathing rebuke to their Avarice. I may quote but a few lines:

*Si l'omme lais d'incontinence  
Soit accusé, la violence  
Du nostre dean tost y parra;  
Car devant tous en audience  
Lors de somonce et de sentence,  
S'il n'ait l'argent dont paiera,  
Sicomme goupil le huera.*<sup>28</sup>

of goddis hestis"; p. 214: "ȝit worldly clerkis cursen for dymes and offryngis"; p. 250: "þes smale curatis schullen haue letteris fro here ordynaries to summone & to curse pore men for nouȝt but for coueitise of anticristis clerkis"; etc.

<sup>24</sup> See, for example, D, 1344, 1348-54, 1434-40, 1530-34, 1576-80, 1598-1603, 1613-17.

<sup>25</sup> "He wolde fecche *a feyned mandement*" (D, 1360). Cf. D, 1586, and Wyclif's "feyned sommenyng" above.

<sup>26</sup> P. 39. Cf. p. 43, foot.

<sup>27</sup> P. 129. Herolt's advocate too is "immisericors, avarus, faciens graves exactiones in sibi subditos."

<sup>28</sup> Ll. 20013-19. See the whole passage (which is in Gower's sum-

Might not the mediæval reader, who knew his Sins so well, have responded in a different fashion from Mr. Tupper's to the references, explicit and implicit, in Chaucer's *exemplum*?

And he would have had Chaucer's *irony* to guide him too. For the *Friar himself* is avaricious, as his turning of penance into pittance, the implications of his tippet stuffed with knives and pins,<sup>29</sup> his courtesy "ther as profit sholde aryse," his friendship with the rich, his exactions from the poor, all show. And the Avarice of his class is a mediæval commonplace.<sup>30</sup> One has, then, Mr. Tupper's third criterion—the opposition of "practice to precept, rule of life to dogma," exquisitely heightened in this case by the fact that an avaricious limitour tells a tale which turns on the overreaching Avarice of a summoner. And it is to be observed that in Mr. Tupper's interpretation of the Tale this element of "delightfully suggestive irony" is wholly wanting, for Chaucer has not represented the Friar as wrathful.<sup>31</sup> And finally,

mary of contemporary social conditions, not in his account of the Sins), ll. 20089 ff.

<sup>29</sup> "ȝif þei [the friars] becomen pedderis berynge knyves, pursis, pynnyss and girdlis and spices and sylk and precious pellure and forrouris for wymmen, and þerto smale gentil hondis, to gete loue of hem and to haue many grete ȝiftes for litil good ore nouȝt; þei coveiten euyle here neigeboris goodis" (Wyclif, ed. Matthew, p. 12).

<sup>30</sup> See Jean de Meun *passim*; Wyclif *passim* (especially on "þese coveytouse foolis þat ben lymytoures," ed. Arnold, III, p. 376); *Mirour de l'Omme*, 21217 ff.; etc.

<sup>31</sup> He scowls (D, 1266), and he tells the Summoner at one point that he lies (D, 1761), and that is all. For this is not the friar, of course, of whose "boar-like frenzy" Tupper speaks. Indeed, the irony which the theory demands is a little intricate in the *Summoner's Tale* (to return to it for a moment). For irony *within the tale* of course does not count in the argument. It is an incongruity between the practice of the teller and the precept of the tale that the theory requires. Now the "homily against Ire"

so far as the *Friar's Tale* is concerned, "the crowning argument" does not apply, for the Friar does not draw upon the *Parson's Tale*.<sup>32</sup> One may cherish some doubt with reference to the Friar-Summoner Tales as a formal exemplification of Wrath.<sup>33</sup>

is put into the mouth *not* of the wrathful Summoner himself, *in propria persona*, but of the representative of the very class against which he is inveighing. It may be that something in my spirit dulleth me, but that seems rather subtle.

<sup>32</sup> Tupper, to be sure, declares that Chaucer "draws upon the Parson's discourse on Anger both for the exact motif of the *Friar's tale of retribution* and for the angry Summoner's morality against *Ire*" (*Publications*, p. 115). This is one of the passages where Mr. Tupper asserts that "the burden of proof certainly rests upon him who dares claim" the contrary (cf. *Journal*, p. 558, top). I have already ventured to challenge the relation between "the exact motif of the *Friar's tale*" and the Parson's sermon. As for the *Summoner's Tale* I shall venture farther. The angry Summoner's "hundred line" morality against *Ire* draws on the discussion of the Sins in the *Parson's Tale* for just three lines, of which Tupper himself notes by implication two (D, 2009-10 = I, 564 f., 534. See above, p. 266. The third line is D, 2075 = I, 617, under Flattery). The flat statement that Chaucer "draws upon the Parson's discourse on Anger . . . for the angry Summoner's morality against *Ire*" is scarcely calculated to convey to the reader an impression in very close accordance with the facts. Tupper's earlier statement (p. 113) is somewhat less inaccurate: "This sermon is derived partly from the *Parson's Tale*, I, 534, 564 f. (Wrath), but chiefly from Seneca's *De Ira*."

<sup>33</sup> It is not without interest that what we really find, by scrupulous application of Mr. Tupper's own methods, is Wrath, Gluttony (*Summoner's Tale*), and Avarice (*Friar's Tale*)—the same triad that emerged from a similar study of the *Pardoner's Tale*. Consistently applied, the theory falls of its own weight—as we shall have further opportunity to see.

## IV

There is left, of the stories that are not found in Gower, the legend of St. Cecilia. This particular Tale can not, as we shall see,<sup>1</sup> be regarded as affording evidence for Mr. Tupper's theory, until the theory is established on other grounds. But I prefer to treat it with its group. The arguments in support of the contention that "the Second Nun [illustrates] Sloth"<sup>2</sup> are five: (1) the Idleness Prologue;<sup>3</sup> (2) the protest of the "Invocatio ad Mariam" against Sloth in its phase of Undevotion;<sup>4</sup> (3) St. Cecilia's own "bisinesse";<sup>5</sup> (4) the element of irony;<sup>6</sup> (5) the kinship between the Prologue and the *Parson's Tale*.<sup>7</sup> Let us consider them briefly in the reverse order.

The first is the "crowning argument." "The lines in the 'Invocation,'" we are told, "that insist upon the value of works (G, 64-65, 77, 79) are closely akin to the passage on 'werkes of goodnessse' in the Parson's discussion of Sloth (I, 690 f.)"<sup>8</sup> The lines of the Invocation are these:

And, for that feith is deed with-outen werkes,  
So for to werken yif me wit and space (64-65).  
Now help, for to my werk I wol me dresse (77).  
Foryeve me, that I do no diligence (79).<sup>9</sup>

The passage on 'werkes of goodnessse' in the *Parson's Tale* (I, 690 f.) is the section on "drede to biginne to werke any gode werkes." It deals with one of the nine

<sup>1</sup> See below, p. 302.

<sup>2</sup> *Publications*, p. 112.

<sup>3</sup> *Publications*, pp. 98, 106.

<sup>4</sup> *Publications*, pp. 106-07; cf. p. 99, n. 10.

<sup>5</sup> *Publications*, pp. 98-99, 106-07, 116, 123.

<sup>6</sup> *Publications*, p. 111.

<sup>7</sup> *Publications*, 107, 115.

<sup>8</sup> *Publications*, p. 107.

<sup>9</sup> See below n. 16.

branches of Accidie—known as *Dilatio* in Peraldus,<sup>10</sup> *Pusillanimites* in *Frère Lorens*,<sup>11</sup> *Pusillanimité* in Gower,<sup>12</sup> *Pusillanimitas* in Raymund of Pennaforte,<sup>13</sup> *Arwenesse* in *Jacob's Well*;<sup>14</sup> etc.—and is followed immediately by *Wanhope*,<sup>15</sup> with which it is closely akin. It has nothing whatever to do with the attitude of mind embodied in the Invocation,<sup>16</sup> and Mr. Tupper's interpretation, of course, assumes the very point at issue. He suggests, however, still another connection. “After a comparison of the Parson's section on Sloth with the Prologue of the Second Nun's Tale, who can miss the present purport of the Idleness stanzas?”<sup>17</sup> They do both deal with Idleness. But for “the Parson's section on Sloth” one might equally well substitute “*Dan Michel's section*”—or any one of half a dozen others. And after stating that there is “a slight verbal connection” (in “conventional epithets”) Mr. Tupper himself concludes

<sup>10</sup> Petersen, p. 62.

<sup>11</sup> Eilers, p. 537.

<sup>12</sup> *Mirour*, ll. 5485 ff.

<sup>13</sup> Petersen, p. 27.

<sup>14</sup> Pp. 106-07; cf. *Ayenbite*, p. 32.

<sup>15</sup> *Desperatio* in Peraldus and Raymund of Pennaforte stands in the same position.

<sup>16</sup> Chaucer is calling upon Mary as he calls upon the “cruel Furie” (*T. and C.*, I, 8-11), Clio (II, 8-10), Venus and Calliope (III, 39-49), and the “Herines” (IV, 22-26) in the *Troilus*; the god of sleep (77-80), Cipris and Thought (518-28), and Apollo (109-93) in the *House of Fame*; and the Flower (94-96) in the B-Prologue to the *Legend*. Line 79 above (taken out of its context) looks a little like “*Dilatio*,” but Mr. Tupper has not included the *next* line in his reference:

*This ilke storie subtilly to endyte*, etc.

The parallel with the Invocation to the third book of the *House of Fame* (for example) is exact:

[thogh] *that I do no diligence*  
*To shewe craft*, etc. (1099-1100).

<sup>17</sup> *Publications*, p. 115.

that "there is here no proof of direct borrowing" from the Parson.<sup>16</sup> The "crowning argument," therefore, is this time also tenuous indeed.

The argument from *irony* is no less shaky. "Of the Second Nun, who was finally chosen to present the Prologues and Tale against Sloth, we unfortunately know nothing."<sup>19</sup> That should, apparently, settle the matter. But Tupper gallantly throws himself into Chaucer's gap. The Nun was "a member of a notoriously slothful class."<sup>20</sup> As proof, we are referred to one example of the laziness of *nuns*—that of the inmates of the Convent in the *Pèlerinage*, who "ech on ha liberte, at þeir lust, to slepe and wake; and noon other hed ne take forto kepe their observaunce"<sup>21</sup>—and the argument is clinched by the fact that "four of the six illustrations of Sloth in Herolt's *Promptuarium Exemplorum* are lazy *monks*"; that "in *Piers Plowman* Sloth is . . . a lazy *priest*"; and that "to the attack upon the Castle of Unity Sloth leads more than a thousand *prelates*".<sup>22</sup> Apart from the logic, all this is scarcely gentle treatment of the Second Nun, long "deed and nayled in hir cheste," and unable to defend herself. But the theory demands that the association of character and Tale be "ironically apt," and how should an unknown nun stand in the way? If Chaucer "have nat seyd it, leve brother," he *meant* it, none the less. For "*this necessary adjustment* Chaucer relegated to the limbo of many of his undertakings, the morrow."<sup>23</sup> Perhaps! "I nam no divinistre; Of

<sup>16</sup> *Publications*, p. 115, n. 45.      <sup>19</sup> *Publications*, p. 111.

<sup>20</sup> *Notes*, p. 11, n. 13; *Publications*, p. 111.

<sup>21</sup> Ll. 23538 ff. The same passage also emphasizes their frowardness and vanity (23599, 23604), their pomp and pride (23611), and their gluttony (23641 ff.).

<sup>22</sup> *Publications*, p. 111, n. 38.      <sup>23</sup> *Notes*, p. 11, n. 13.

[nonnes] finde I nat in this registre." And an irony that confessedly depends on what Chaucer *would* (in Mr. Tupper's judgment) have written, but never *did*, demands an act of faith for its acceptance.

Mr. Tupper's contention rests, then, upon the Tale itself, the Invocation, and the Prologue. So far as the Tale itself is concerned, it is the legend of a *virgin martyr*.<sup>24</sup> And Mr. Tupper leaves (as he must) the story as Chaucer tells it entirely out of the reckoning. It is upon a supposedly traditional view of St. Cecilia herself that his case rests. She is, for him, "that antitype of Sloth . . . the 'bee' of the mediæval homilist, renowned not only for her celibacy but for 'hir lasting bisenesse.'"<sup>25</sup> And he uniformly refers to her as "the traditionally busy Saint Cecilia";<sup>26</sup> "the type of busyness, Saint Cecilia";<sup>27</sup> "a typically busy saint."<sup>28</sup> Do the facts warrant so sweeping a generalization? His evidence proves, on analysis, to be threefold: the testimony of the "*Interpretacio*"; a sermon of Jacobus de Voragine; and an *exemplum* in the *Flores Exemplorum*.

According to the "*Interpretacio*,"<sup>29</sup> St. Cecilia stands for (1) "pure chastnesse of virginitee" (*virginitatis pudorem*); (2) "whytnesse of honestee" (*candorem munditiae*); (3) "grene of conscience" (*viorem con-*

<sup>24</sup> It is "the lyf of Seint Cecyle," as Chaucer twice designates it himself (G, 554, *Leg. B*, 426 = A, 416). It is the "glorious lyf and passioun" of the "mayde and martir" that he does his "feithful bisenesse" to translate, and it is on her chastity and her martyrdom that the stress is laid (ll. 270-83). Cf. also *Publications of the Modern Language Association*, xxvi, pp. 315-23; xxix, pp. 129-33. To the examples there given of the symbolic use of roses and lilies for martyrdom and virginity I can now add many others drawn entirely from the Latin hymns.

<sup>25</sup> *Publications*, pp. 98-99.      <sup>26</sup> *Publications*, p. 106; *Notes*, p. 11.

<sup>27</sup> *Publications*, pp. 107, 123.      <sup>28</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 116.

<sup>29</sup> G, 85-119.

scientiae); (4) "ensample... by good techinge" (exempli informationem); (5) "thoght of holinesse" (jugem contemplationem); (6) "lasting bisenesse" (assiduum operationem); (7) "grete light of sapience" (sapientiae splendorem); (8) "of feith the magnanimitee" (fidei magnanimitatem); (9) "the cleernesse hool of sapience" (sapientiae perspicacitatem); (10) "good werkinge" (operationem sollicitam); (11) "good perseveringe" (perseverantiam); (12) "charitee ful brighte" (caritatem succensam); (13) "sondry werkes, bright of excellence" (virtutum varietatem).<sup>30</sup> Cecilia's "bisenesse," then, is one out of a list of *ten*<sup>31</sup> qualities. The discarding of the other nine, and the retention of this one alone as Cecilia's "typical" quality stands in need of justification.

That justification the *Sermones Aurei* seem, at first blush, to offer. For in them, we are told, "St. Cecilia is likened to a bee on account of her *five-fold busyness*: her spiritual devotion, humility, contemplation, teaching and exhortation, sagacity."<sup>32</sup> The testimony of the sermons demands fuller consideration than Professor Tupper accords it, and I shall first give myself the pleasure of stating his case far more strongly than he has stated it himself. For he has overlooked the fact that in the *Tale itself* Cecilia is likened to a bee. It is Urban who is speaking:

*So, lyk a bisy bee, with-outen gyle,  
Thee serveth ay thyn owene thral Cecile!*<sup>33</sup>

<sup>30</sup> For the Latin, see *Originals and Analogues*, p. 192.

<sup>31</sup> I have counted (7) and (9), (6) and (10), each as *one*—although (6) and (10) are really distinct.

<sup>32</sup> *Publications*, p. 99, n. 10.

<sup>33</sup> G, 195-96; cf. 191-99. The bee is not found in the version of the Legend in the Ashmole MS. (*Originals and Analogues*, p. 210), or in the Northern English version (MSS. Harl. 4196) printed by Horst-

Chaucer is here (and in the immediate context) translating the following passage in the *Legenda Aurea*:

domine Jesu Christe, seminator casti consilii, suscipe seminum fructus, quos in Caecilia seminasti, domine Jesu Christe, pastor bone, Caecilia famula tua *quasi apis tibi argumentosa deservit*; nam sponsum, quem quasi leonem ferocem accepit, ad te quasi agnum mansuetissimum destinavit.<sup>34</sup>

And this same passage (as Mr. Tupper also failed to observe) has found a place in the service of the church.<sup>35</sup> In the Office for St. Cecilia's day the second lesson of the first Nocturn closes: "*Quasi apis argumentosa Domino deservisti.—Urbanum.*" The sixth lesson (second Nocturn) closes with the entire passage quoted above from the Legend.<sup>36</sup> In the Laudes the phrase occurs again: "*Caecilia famula tua, Domine, quasi apis tibi argumentosa deservit.*"<sup>37</sup> I wish to give these facts their full weight, and I am doing even more than that by quoting them as I have done out of their setting. No one can read the Office impartially without seeing that the references to St. Cecilia as the bee are *incidental*. The Office, to a far greater degree than the Tale itself, is devoted to the glorification of Cecilia's *virginity and martyrdom*. But the Office brings us to the sermons.

For it is precisely that passage from the Legend which appears in the Office that Jacobus de Voragine elucidates

mann (*Altenglische Legenden*, 1881, p. 161), or in Aelfric (ed. Skeat, E. E. T. S., II, pp. 356 ff.). It is in Caxton (*Originals and Analogues*, p. 211), but Caxton is following Chaucer.

<sup>34</sup> *Originals and Analogues*, p. 194.

<sup>35</sup> I have not access to the older rituals. I am quoting from the *Breviarium Romanum* (Pars Autumnalis) in current use.

<sup>36</sup> With the omission of the second "domine . . . bone."

<sup>37</sup> It is *argumentosa*, not "bisy," which is traditional, it should be noted. See below, p. 295, n. 43.

in two of his three sermons on St. Cecilia.<sup>38</sup> At the close of his second sermon,<sup>39</sup> on the text, “*Mulier diligens, corona est viro suo,*” he thus comments on the *lectio*:

Unde dixit Urbanus: Suscipe seminum fructus, quos in Caecilia seminasti. Quia erat apis argumentosa, et ille nimis insipidus, idcirco ipsum speciali dulcedine dulcoravit. *Brevis in volatilibus est apis, et initium dulcoris habet fructus illius.*<sup>40</sup>

The third sermon has for its text the passage from *Ecclesiasticus* (xi, 3) which Jacobus has just quoted. And he proceeds:

Caecilia apis vocata est sicut testatur Urbanus dicens: Caecilia . . . deseruit [as above]. In istis ergo verbis praedictis a S. Urbanu quinque implicantur, scilicet quod *S. Caecilia fuit apis, et brevis apis, et volatilis apis, et mellifica apis, et argumentosa apis.*

This “five-fold busyness,”<sup>41</sup> then, is amplified under the following heads:

Primo fuit apis in quantum exercitavit se circa dulcedinem devotionis. Mel quidem generatur a rore, et a flore, miro apis artificio aedificata de cera domo, ne mel defluat, sed conservetur. Devotione quidem spiritualis habetur a rore S. Spiritus infundente . . . Secundo fuit apis brevis in quantum se exercitavit circa humilitatem: quae consideratur, et quia brevis dicitur, et quia mel ab ipsa generatur. Per mel enim humilitas intelligitur. . . Tertio dicitur apis volatilis in quantum exercitavit se per contemplationem. Apes autem ad olandum per quatuor inducuntur, scilicet per tempus serenum, per abundantiam flororum, per dulce vinum, et per sonum. . . Quarto dicitur mellificans apis in quantum exercitavit se circa dulcem doctrinam, et exhortationem. . . Quinto dicitur argumentosa apis, quae quidem sagacitas attenditur, quantum ad tria, etc.<sup>42</sup>

<sup>38</sup> On the entrance of the Legends as *lectiones* into the Office of the Church, see Horstmann's valuable introduction to his *Altenglische Legenden*, pp. xii ff. On their use in the *homilies*, see pp. xxiii ff.

<sup>39</sup> *Sermones Aurei* (1760), II, p. 361.      <sup>40</sup> *Ecclesiasticus*, XI, 3.

<sup>41</sup> The phrase is due, I suppose, to the four times repeated “exercitavit” below.

<sup>42</sup> I have had to omit, of course, the still more detailed elaboration of the symbolism.

I have now given, I think, all the pertinent facts. Do they warrant for St. Cecilia the sobriquet of "the traditionally busy saint"?

So far as the *argument* is concerned, I am perfectly willing to waive the point, and save both time and space. The conclusion would not be affected in the least. But the method of interpretation that is involved is more important than the particular point (in this case) at issue. For Mr. Tupper has metamorphosed a subordinate and incidental reference into a typifying formula. The reference is so purely incidental in the Legend and the Tale that Tupper, in his search for evidence, overlooked it altogether.<sup>43</sup> As for the Sermon, the assumption that it gives *traditional* warrant to the view that Cecilia's "*first trait*"<sup>44</sup> . . . was the sweetness of spiritual devotion,"<sup>45</sup> leaves out of account once more the "mediæval perspective." It overlooks, that is, the distinction, in the homiletics of the Middle Ages, between what is genuinely traditional, and what is purely or largely *ad hoc*. For the allegorizing tendencies of mediæval sermonizing<sup>46</sup> left untried or untortured no remotest possibility of symbolic treatment. This tendency, strong in itself, was heightened by the custom of drawing the texts from the introits, the gospels, and the epistles for the day,<sup>47</sup> or (as in the

<sup>43</sup> Chaucer's translation of "argumentosa" by "bisy" is itself inaccurate, and doubtless represents the "well-worn [convention] track." Given "bee," the chances are large in favor of "busy" as the epithet. Compare E, 2422 (in a very different context!): "for ay as *bisy as bees* Been they [women], us sely men for to deceyve." In Jacobus (who also represents "tradition") the bee is *brevis, volatilis, mellifica*, and *argumentosa*.

<sup>44</sup> On the preceding page it is her "peculiar quality."

<sup>45</sup> *Publications*, p. 107.

<sup>46</sup> See, for example, Crane, *The Exempla of Jacques de Vitry* (Folk Lore Society), pp. lxxx ff.

<sup>47</sup> See Crane, pp. xxxviii, lv, lx, lxiii-iv, lxviii, etc., and the *Sermones Aurei*, *passim*.

present instance) from the suggestion of the *lectio*, and by the consequent necessity of finding (in the case of *Sermones de Sanctis*) some connecting link between text and saint.<sup>48</sup> And in no mediæval preacher is this *pengkapht* for fine-spun allegorizing stronger than in Jacobus de Voragine. St. Paul is compared to a vase;<sup>49</sup> St. Margarita to a treasure hid in a field;<sup>50</sup> St. Dominic to the morning star,<sup>51</sup> the full moon,<sup>52</sup> salt,<sup>53</sup> and light;<sup>54</sup> St. Lawrence to gold<sup>55</sup> and fire;<sup>56</sup> St. Katherine to a field in which treasure is hid<sup>57</sup>—and so on *ad libitum*.<sup>58</sup> It

<sup>48</sup> In the *Sermones Aurei* (II, p. 246) St. Hippolytus and his comrades are compared to *sparrows*. Why? The text is from Psalm 124: “Anima nostra sicut passer erupta est de laqueo venantium.” And the sermon begins: “Ad honorem sancti Hippolyti et sociorum ejus iste versiculus in Missa decantatur. In Evangelio etiam hodierno in exemplum Sanctorum passeres introducuntur.” And so Jacobus sets himself cheerfully to his exegesis.

<sup>49</sup> II, p. 79: “Primo fuit mirabiliter confictus, quod patet quia de limo humilitatis profunda, et aqua compunctionis lachrymosae fuit confictus. . . Secundo istud vas fuit mirabiliter pictum, scilicet colore albo virginalis munditiae”—and so on through six parallels.

<sup>50</sup> II, p. 217: “Thesaurus . . . est autem aurum virginitas, argentum fides, lapides pretiosi opera pietatis,” etc.

<sup>51</sup> II, pp. 233-34: “Stella matutina est lucifer qui quidem est calidus, humidus, jucundus, et Solis nuncius. Sic B. Dominicus fuit calidus per ferventem zelum . . . fuit humidus per lachramarum effusionem . . . fuit jucundus, et hoc in mente per conscientiae serenitatem [similarly, in facie, sermone, conversatione],” etc.

<sup>52</sup> P. 234. I shall not rehearse his “quadruplicem plenitudinem”!

<sup>53</sup> P. 240.

<sup>54</sup> *Ibid.*—with three reasons.

<sup>55</sup> P. 241: “Dicitur aurum in quantum fuit Praelatus. Et in quantum fuit Martyr invictus. Et in quantum fuit Praedicator glorirosus”—and each of the three is worked out in unimaginable detail.

<sup>56</sup> P. 243: “Notandum est, quod est quadruplex ignis, scilicet interior sive spiritualis, exterior sive materialis, superior sive caelestis, et inferior sive infernalis.” I omit the exposition!

<sup>57</sup> P. 368: “Ager iste fuit animus Catherinae, in quo crevit, et floruit lily puritatis, rosa charitatis, et viola humilitatis. In

is in the light of facts like these that Jacobus's account of St. Cecilia's "peculiar virtue" must be read.<sup>59</sup> Nor is this all. For St. Cecilia shares with others her typifying quality. St. Ambrosius is also, by the same token, "the traditionally busy saint." For he, too, is compared to the bee:

Assimilatur autem api triplici de causa. Primo, quia sicut ipse dicit in exameron, apis virginitatem custodit . . . Secundo assimilatur api. Apis florem de diversis floribus colligit: In prato quidem caelestis viriditatis sunt diversi flores, etc. . . . Tertio assimilatur api, quia apis alveolum defendit: sic et ipse defendit ecclesiam a tribus persecutoribus [i. e., tyrants, heretics, and demons].<sup>60</sup>

And the Blessed Virgin is "busy" too:

Apis dicitur Virgo Maria, quia fuit brevis per humilitatem, volatilis per supernorum contemplationem, mellificans per caelestis fructus productionem,<sup>a</sup> etc.

isto agro absconditus est thesaurus martyrii . . . et thesaurus divinae sapientiae, et virginalis munditia, et caelestis gloriae," etc.

<sup>a</sup> The Virgin is compared to Amygdalus, Aquaeductus, Arbor Caelestis, Arca Dei, Arcus caelestis, Aurora, Balsamum, Candela, Cedrus, Cælum, Cinnamomum, Cypressus, Collum, Columba, Crater, Ebur, Elephas, Fons Dei, Gallina, Libanus, Lilium Dei, Luna, Lux, Mare, Myrrha, Nardus, Navis, Nubes, Oliva, Ovis Dei, Palma, Ros, Rosa, Speculum, Stella, Terra, Vellus, Virga, Vitis. See the *tabula* to the *Sermones Aurei de Laudibus Deiparae Virginis*. Each symbol represents the heading of a separate sermon.

<sup>59</sup> I shall quote only the close of the paragraph on her "sweetness of spiritual devotion": "Conservatur autem in vase solido, id est per patientiam, et perseverantiam firmam; alias enim spargitur si per impatientiam frangitur: *Cor fatui quasi vas confractum, et omnem sapientiam non tenebit.*" Quite apart from the allegorizing, it is to be observed that (according to the Parson) this is not *Sloth* at all. "Patience, that is another remedye agayns *Ire*" (I, § 50). See below, p. 315.

<sup>60</sup> II, pp. 151-52. He is then compared to a *lion* (after the *Bestiary*), because the lion sleeps with its eyes open, wakens its young, and obliterates its tracks with its tail; then to *honey*, for two reasons. The *text* is Samson's riddle!

<sup>a</sup> *Sermones de Laudibus*, etc., p. 7. The *text* is that of the sermon on St. Cecilia.

In a word, the case stands thus: Mr. Tupper finds in his documents the fault of Undevotion, one of the chief phases of Sloth. For he regards the "Invocatio" as embodying the *opposite* of Undevotion. St. Cecilia's peculiar virtue, then, should also be antipathetic to that. And so he bases her "sweetness of spiritual devotion" (which she undoubtedly possessed) *as traditionally her "first trait,"* upon a case of *ad hoc* homiletic allegorizing. St. Cecilia was without question "busy,"<sup>62</sup> and she was endowed with spiritual devotion. But there is no valid evidence that these were her two outstanding, *traditional* qualities. The other twelve traits<sup>63</sup> which Jean de Vigny and Jacobus de Voragine enumerate have absolutely equal claims with the arbitrarily selected two. Once more, it is not in this instance so much the fact which counts, as the principle of interpretation.

The same remark applies to Mr. Tupper's next piece of evidence. "In the *Flores Exemplorum* ... Cecilia exemplifies Fortitude, which, as the Parson tells us (I, 727 f.), is the 'remedy' against the Sin of Sloth."<sup>64</sup> Fortitude undoubtedly is, not only in the *Parson's Tale*, but in other treatments of the Seven Deadly Sins as well,<sup>65</sup> set over against Sloth. But Fortitude, even in the Middle Ages, was not *preempted* by the Seven Deadly Sins. Mr. Tupper would seemingly have us believe that the mediæval mind lived and moved and had its being solely in the Sins; that nothing once associated with them retained thereafter independent entity. But the Four

<sup>62</sup> I waive the "argumentosa," and accept Chaucer's "bisinesse" for "assiduam operationem."

<sup>63</sup> I have counted *contemplation*, *sagacity* (which appears three times), and *teaching*, each only once.

<sup>64</sup> *Publications*, p. 98, n. 9.

<sup>65</sup> See below, p. 327.

Cardinal Virtues and the Twelve Moral Virtues survived as such their partial inclusion as antitypes within the categories of the Vices. Thus, in the *Pèlerinage*, Fortitude is the habergeon of the Pilgrim's armor.<sup>66</sup> And Jacobus de Voragine extols the fourfold Fortitude of another Virgin martyr, St. Agatha:

Beata autem Agatha quadruplicem fortitudinem habuit . . . Prima igitur fortitudo fuit, quia sexum fragilem virtute animi superavit . . . Secunda fortitudo fuit, quia contra mundi et tyranni saevitiam pugnavit et vicit [in four contests] . . . Tertio prae dulcedine Dei omnia mundi oblectamenta despexit . . . Quarto in morte per martyrium triumphavit.<sup>67</sup>

Fortitude was, indeed (as we should expect), the peculiar virtue of *all* martyrs, of whom, in the *Ayenbite*, it is again St. Agatha who is the type—"an suo dede þe martires . . . huer-of we redeþ of zayne agase þet mid greate blisse hi yede to torment alsuo ase hi yede to feste oþer to a bredale."<sup>68</sup> The fact that St. Cecilia illustrates Fortitude in an *exemplum* is insufficient warrant for the inference that she was in any special fashion whatsoever regarded as the antitype of Sloth.<sup>69</sup>

The crowning argument does not help us; the irony rests on pure assumption; the Tale itself has quite another emphasis; the tradition of the "busy saint" is at best but incidentally traditional.<sup>70</sup> There is left the testimony

<sup>66</sup> Ll. 7553 ff. See especially ll. 7553-69.

<sup>67</sup> II, pp. 90-91.

<sup>68</sup> P. 166 (under "Pruesse").

<sup>69</sup> Compare the fourteenth-century *exemplum* cited by Herbert (*Catalogue of Romances*, III, p. 632), under the heading "De fortitudine et partibus eius," in which a bishop and his people take refuge from Attila in a church, and suffer martyrdom. Is the bishop to be regarded as an antitype of Sloth?

<sup>70</sup> I have not access at the moment to the vast collections of the *Analecta hymnica*. I know that they are rich in hymns to St. Cecilia. It is possible that Mr. Tupper may find support for his

of the Invocation and the Prologue. "Among the chief phases of [Sloth] is the fault, antipathetic to Cecilia's peculiar virtue,—Undevotion. . . . This Undevotion is definitely represented as neglect of Hymns of our Lord and of our Lady, and of the Daily Service. Now the 'Invocacio ad Mariam' . . . is drawn not only from Dante but from the Hours of the Virgin . . . and is therefore the most effective sort of protest against Sloth in its phase of Undevotion."<sup>71</sup> The Invocation is, indeed, "that antidote to Sloth,"<sup>72</sup> and in it "who can . . . ignore the *formal intent* of the zest of devotion and zeal of good works?"<sup>73</sup> That is (as I make it out), one branch of Sloth is Undevotion, or the neglect of Hymns and Hours. The opposite of Undevotion is Devotion, which does *not* neglect the Hymns and Hours. The "Invocacio" does not neglect them, for it quotes them. Therefore it stands for Devotion, the (*assumed*) opposite of Undevotion,<sup>74</sup> a branch of Sloth, and therefore it is "the most effective sort of protest against Sloth." Just who is to be credited with the freedom from Undevotion—St. Cecilia (its antitype), the Second Nun (its assumed type), or the ironical Chaucer himself—is not

contention there, if it is to be found anywhere. I recall no evidence for it from the hymns. But this point was not in my mind when I read them. At all events, I proffer the reference, which I should use myself, if I could.

<sup>71</sup> *Publications*, pp. 106-07.

<sup>72</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 99, n. 10; cf. *Notes*, p. 11: "its . . . Invocation, full of the spiritual devotion that is ever the antidote of this Deadly Sin."

<sup>73</sup> *Publications*, pp. 115-16.

<sup>74</sup> Incidentally it may be remarked that *Devotion*, Cecilia's "peculiar virtue" appears in the *Mirour de l'Omme* as the first branch of Humility, the antitype of *Pride*. It is there accompanied by Prayer, and Gower devotes 659 lines to it (ll. 10177-10836). As an antitype of *Sloth* I know it only in *Jacob's Well* (pp. 283-84), where it manifests itself in *weeping*.

quite clear. The point is one which Mr. Tupper, untroubled by the contagion of his theory, is far too good a scholar to have made.

And in spite of himself he has furnished his own antidote. "No one has noted," he tells us in his latest article,<sup>75</sup> "that such a prelude to a Miracle of the Virgin or to a Life of a saint is a literary convention even more common than the 'Idleness' prologue," and he further points out that "in his large drafts upon the universally familiar Hours, Chaucer was but following the tradition of the religious lyric."<sup>76</sup> And precisely the same thing holds good of the Prologue also. It is an "Idleness" Prologue, but it is also a stock convention. To the examples pointed out by Professor Carleton Brown<sup>77</sup> Tupper himself has made two important additions.<sup>78</sup> I am well aware of the fact that a conventional device may be given a non-conventional turn, but the evidence for such a deflection from common usage must be far stronger than that which Mr. Tupper has thus far presented. On the face of it, Chaucer is merely doing, in both the Prologue and the Invocation, what had been done again and again—precisely "*the sort of thing*" (as Mr. Tupper himself puts it) "*that every rimer of his time does well.*"<sup>79</sup> The significance attached to both Prologue and Invocation rests solely, in other words, upon its assumed coincidence with the other elements of the cipher.

<sup>75</sup> *Notes*, p. 10.

<sup>76</sup> *Ibid.* He also shows (n. 6) that Barclay as well as Chaucer uses both Idleness Prologue and "an elaborate Invocation to the Virgin richer even than Chaucer's in liturgical phrases."

<sup>77</sup> *Modern Philology*, IX, pp. 1-4.

<sup>78</sup> *Notes*, p. 10, n. 6.

<sup>79</sup> *Notes*, p. 11. Mr. Tupper happens, when he says this, to be arguing for another thesis, which gives his testimony added weight.

For that it is a "Sins cipher" that Mr. Tupper has constructed, there can be, I think, no doubt. One of Cecilia's twelve qualities in the *Legenda Aurea* is "bisinesse"; one of her five in the *Sermones Aurei* is Devotion; and there is a Fortitude *exemplum*. On the other side are two of the nine branches of Sloth—Idleness and Undevotion—and the *remedium* Fortitude. And as a result of the proper permutations and combinations of these elements, the declaration that the writer is doing his "feithful bisinesse" to avoid the dangers of Idleness becomes an exemplification of the Sin itself; a still more conventional use of Hymns of our Lady in the Invocation to the Virgin becomes "the most effective sort of protest against Sloth"; and "the glorious lyf and passioun" of the "mayde and martir, saint Cecilie" becomes "the tale of the traditionally busy St. Cecilia"—and therefore "the Second Nun [illustrates] Sloth." If this is a typically mediæval process, where are the parallels?

And Chaucer himself had none of this in mind when Prologue, Invocation, and Tale came from his pen! Mr. Tupper argues ably, on the ground of "the time-honored function of such a prelude as Chaucer's 'Invocacio ad Mariam'" that the Invocation and the Tale were composed at the same time. That the Prologues and the Tale "were combined at a period prior to the composition of the *Canterbury Tales*," admits (as he grants) no doubt.<sup>80</sup> The whole composition is "*former material converted to the purposes of the motif*";<sup>81</sup> it is a "treasure-trove of [Chaucer's] portfolio."<sup>82</sup> And the device of the Sins (it will be remembered) came to Chaucer late<sup>83</sup>—"in the latter half of the Canterbury series." So far

<sup>80</sup> *Notes*, pp. 10-11.

<sup>82</sup> *Notes*, p. 11.

<sup>81</sup> *Publications*, p. 99, n. 10.

<sup>83</sup> *Publications*, p. 118.

as Chaucer's original purpose is concerned, the intricate significance we are asked to read into the composition is absolutely fortuitous. And in Mr. Tupper's own mature judgment, nothing was added later. The evidence in the case of the *Second Nun's Tale*, even were it ten times as strong as it is, becomes valid, therefore, *only when the validity of the theory as a whole is established*. For on Mr. Tupper's own explicit testimony the association of this Tale with the Sins is *ex post facto*. It may therefore be left in its limbo for the present.<sup>84</sup>

<sup>84</sup> Since we are on the subject of Sloth, it is necessary to call attention to a statement of Mr. Tupper's that is not immediately connected with the *Second Nun's Tale*. It is in his general discussion of the categories (*Publications*, p. 95). "From our point of view it is natural to protest against the inclusion of 'the thief on the cross' under Langland's head of Sloth, and yet, as R. W. Chambers points out, that dilatory sinner finds a place *in every formal description of that vice.*" Mr. Chambers does not point this out, and it is not the case. What Chambers says (*Modern Language Review*, v, p. 5) is this: "Now Skeat pointed out long ago that the right place for the penitent thief is under Sloth, *under the sub-heading Wanhope, which always belongs to Accidie.*" (Even that is not quite true, for the *Ayenbite*, p. 29, and *Jacob's Well*, p. 85, put it among the Sins against the Holy Ghost, under *Envy*, and the *Mirror of St. Edmund*, p. 24, places "whanhope of þe blysse of heuene" under *Lechery*, as does also Raymund of Pennaforte; see Petersen, p. 27). That is a very different thing indeed from Mr. Tupper's statement. What Skeat says may be found in his edition of *Piers Plowman*, II, p. 88, where he remarks that "his [the thief's] repentance was the *stock example* of an argument against Wanhope as resulting from Sloth." On p. 97 he refers to the *Parson's Tale*, *Handlyng Synne*, l. 5171, and the *Ayenbite*, p. 34. In point of fact, the penitent thief does not occur under Wanhope (or even Sloth) in the *Cursor Mundi*, Gaytryge's sermon or the *Lay Folks' Catechism*, *Jacob's Well*, the *Pèlerinage*, the *Confessio Amantis*, the *Mirour de l'Omme*—to name no more. Similarly, Mr. Tupper says (*Publications*, p. 103, n. 22): "*Every mediæval account of Envy records these traits [its Satanic origin and serpent-like nature].*" Many record one, many the other, some both—but the "serpent-like

## V

We have now to consider the four Tales—the Physician's, the Man of Law's, the Manciple's, and the Wife of Bath's—the themes of which are common to Chaucer and Gower. And first it may be remarked in general that if Chaucer were to tell *any* tales that Gower told too, they must inevitably be, in Mr. Tupper's theory, "Sins tales." For, the *Confessio Amantis* being what it is, "Sins tales" are the only sort<sup>1</sup> that Gower told. Other considerations aside, every one of Chaucer's Legends except those of Cleopatra, Hypsipyle, and Hypermnestra is as much a "Sins tale" as are the stories of Virginia, Constance, Apollo and the crow, and the Loathly Lady. *In itself*, the coincidence with Gower is wholly without weight.<sup>2</sup> The case for the four tales must rest on other

nature" is wanting, for instance, from the *Parson's Tale* itself. The statement that "the commonplaces [on "gentillesse"] inevitably appear in *all* mediæval discourses upon Pride" (*Publications*, p. 100) is another case in point. See below, p. 343, n. 9. The statement (*Journal*, p. 557) that Barclay "devotes the largest space in his *Ship* to the tavern-revelers—drinkers, lechers, dicers, blasphemers," is still another. Even granting Mr. Tupper his own wide latitude in the interpretation of "tavern-revelers," less than a dozen at most, out of the one hundred and fifteen sections of the *Ship of Fools*, may be stretched to come under that head. These are, of course, merely offhand or insufficiently considered statements, but they are none the less somewhat damaging to an argument, when they are used as evidence.

<sup>1</sup> With the exception to be noted below, p. 306.

<sup>2</sup> See above, p. Did Gower use these stories because they were *per se* "Sins tales," or did they become, *pro tempore*, "Sins tales" because he diverted them to his immediate purpose? The stories of Capaneus (*Confessio*, I, 1977 ff.), Socrates (III, 639 ff.), Daphne (III, 1685 ff.), Phaeton and Icarus (IV, 978 ff.), for example, are all told by Gower as exemplifying Sins. Suppose that Chaucer (who makes use of all these personages) had told their stories as separate

grounds, and it is these grounds that now concern us. We may begin with the *Physician's Tale*. What are its "tags"?

The first is the "crowning argument." "Only one of the Sins tales—that of the Physician (Gower's *exemplum* of Lechery)—confesses in its moralities no indebtedness or close resemblance to the Parson's discussion of the corresponding Vice."<sup>3</sup>

The second is the element of irony. "No Prologue specifically indicates the Physician's peculiar disqualification for his theme of Lechery, but the mediæval reader must have been tickled by the praise of purity from a profession notorious in the fourteenth century for its willingness to increase the passions of lovers [etc.] . . . This suggestion of satire in the case of the Doctor is only a plausible conjecture."<sup>4</sup> This stand-by also leaves us in the lurch.

Tales, without other indication of his purpose. Would the Middle Ages have interpreted them—"even though their title or tag were lacking"—as exemplifying Pride, Wrath (Cheste and Foolhaste) and Sloth respectively, any more than they so interpreted the stories of the *Legend*? Despite Mr. Tupper's words just quoted (*Publications*, p. 96), the application of the story must be made clear. He argues (rather inconsistently with his statement that tags were unnecessary) that the application is made clear in the Tales that follow, and that is what we have to see.

<sup>3</sup> *Publications*, p. 116. "But"—Mr. Tupper proceeds—"this omission seems the less striking, when we remark the generous use of the section on Lechery in the so-called Marriage Group, particularly in the *Merchant's Tale*." That is (once more), "if he have not seyd hem, leve brother, In o book, he hath seyd hem in another." (*The Merchant's Tale* might have something to say for itself, too. See below, p. 365). Tupper's note on the same page is merely snatching at a straw, as the text makes clear.

<sup>4</sup> *Publications*, pp. 110-11. Tupper, it will be observed, is creating a new category of the *professions*, as exemplifications of the Seven Deadly Sins. "The Gluttony of the Pardoner [is] a traditional trait of that tribe" (*Publications*, p. 117). Nuns exemplify Sloth. Physicians now stand for Lechery. We shall soon see that Lawyers and

We are thrown back, then, exclusively upon the Tale itself. And the Tale, Mr. Tupper assures us, is "Gower's *exemplum* of Lechery."<sup>5</sup> *But Gower does not include it under the Seven Deadly Sins at all.* It is in the digression (which occupies all of the seventh book) on Aristotle's philosophy, and it falls under the last of the *Five Points of Policy*—Truth, Largess, Justice, Pity, and Chastity.<sup>6</sup> His treatment of Chastity is throughout with reference to *princes and rulers*,<sup>7</sup> and the *exempla* are those of Cyrus, Amalech, Solomon, Antonius, Tarquin, and Appius.<sup>8</sup> And the moral of the tale of Appius and

Merchants exemplify Envy, as well as Avarice. Five of the Seven Sins are accounted for. So far as the Physicians are concerned, Tupper's inferences from the facts he gives are gratuitous. And one of the facts is wrong. The long passage in the *Confessio Amantis* (vi, 1292-1358) which he cites (p. 111, n. 37) deals with Sorcery and Witchcraft (specifically with Geomancy, Hydromancy, Pyromancy, Nigromancy, etc.), and has nothing to do with Physicians. And anyway, *it is under Gluttony*. See also the gloss opposite ll. 1261 ff.

<sup>5</sup> *Publications*, p. 116. He refers to it elsewhere as "the Physician's version of Gower's theme of Lechery in the *Confessio Amantis*" (p. 97; cf. n. 7); as "another Gower story, that of Lechery" (p. 127); and states again that "in the Physician's Tale Chaucer, like Gower in his version of the theme, . . . is telling a story of Lechery, and of its antitype, Chastity" (*Notes*, p. 5).

\*The discussion of Chastity is in ll. 4215-5397; the story of Appius and Virginia in ll. 5131-5306. Lechery is the only one of the Sins to which Gower gives no categorical treatment. Each of the other Vices is specifically named (see Bk. I, ll. 580 ff., and the opening paragraphs of Books II-VII); Book VIII treats of the Laws of Marriage, and of one branch of Lechery, Incest. It is worth noting that Gower's specific treatment of *Virginity* is under Robbery, a branch of *Avarice* (see v, 6338 ff., and especially the heading and gloss to v, 6359 ff.).

<sup>7</sup> See VII, 4209-14, 4239-56, 4308-12, 4351-60, 4446-58, 4546-78, 5124-30.

<sup>8</sup> The last *exemplum*, that of Tobias, constitutes (as the gloss makes clear) a transition to the discussion of the Laws of Marriage in the next book.

Virginia, like that of the others, has specific reference to the Point of Policy:

And thus thunchaste was chastised,  
*Whereof thei myhte ben avised*  
*That scholden afterward governe,*  
*And be this evidence lerne,*  
*Hou it is good a king eschuie*  
*The lust of vice and vertu suie.*<sup>9</sup>

Precisely similar is its "moral" in Jean de Meun, where it is an *exemplum* of the *inequity of judges*:

Tex juge fait le larron pendre,  
*Qui miex déust estre pendus,*  
*Se jugemens li fust rendus*  
*Des rapines et des tors fais*  
*Qu'il a par son pooir forfais.*<sup>10</sup>

Then comes the *exemplum*; and the conclusion of the whole matter, when the tale is told, is this:

*Briefment juges font trop d'outrages.*<sup>11</sup>

Nor is it different in Hans Sachs:<sup>12</sup>

Inn der geschicht zu Rom geschehen  
*Habt ir als in eym spiegel gsehen,*  
*Wie alle ungerechtigkeyt*  
*Kumpft an den tag zu seiner zeyt,*  
*Gestraffet ausz götlicher rach . . .*  
*Auch über das secht ir darbey,*  
*Wo herrschaft seins gewalts miszbraucht,*  
*Wie plötzlich sie zu grunde haucht.*  
*Wo sie wütet in tyranney . . .*  
*Desz reich zu grund geht an dem end.*  
*Dagegen wo gut regiment*  
*Ist über leut und über land, etc.*<sup>13</sup>

<sup>9</sup> VII, 5301-06.

<sup>10</sup> Ed. Michel, I, p. 186.

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 189.

<sup>12</sup> Tupper admits Hans Sachs (*Publications*, p. 98, n. 8) as a belated witness, and so may we.

<sup>13</sup> Ed. von Keller, II, pp. 19-20.

What is *Chaucer's* moral? Here it is:

Heer men may seen how sinne hath his meryte!  
 Beth war, for no man woot whom god wol smyte  
 In no degree, ne in which maner wyse  
 The worm of conscience may agryse  
 Of wikked lyf, though it so privee be,  
 That no man woot ther-of but god and he.  
 For be he lewed man or elles lered,  
 He noot how sone that he shal been afered.  
 Therfore I rede yow this conseil take,  
 Forsaketh sinne, er sinne yow forsake.<sup>14</sup>

Not a word of Lechery is there. Mr. Tupper twice refers to this "moral." "The ten-line 'application' at the close of the Tale . . . is the traditional ending of an 'ensample' of *Sin*:<sup>15</sup>

Heer men may seen how sinne hath his meryte!  
 Beth war, for no man woot whom god wol smyte, etc.<sup>16</sup>

*So the moral is driven home.*"<sup>17</sup> But what moral? Again: "At the end of another Gower story, that of Lechery, Chaucer says plainly (C, 277 f.) :—[here follow the same two lines as above]. Evidently," continues Mr. Tupper, "Chaucer was quite in the dark about himself!"<sup>18</sup> It looks a little as if he were. And Harry Bailly also was the more deceived:

'Harrow!' quod he, 'by nayles and by blood!  
 This was a fals cherl and a fals justyse!  
 As shameful deeth as herte may devyse  
 Come to thise juges and hir advocats!'<sup>19</sup>

<sup>14</sup> C, 277-286. Compare also ll. 267-76 for the real "*leit-motif* of the Doctor's story" (p. 116, n. 46), as Chaucer tells it.

<sup>15</sup> Italics mine. Mr. Tupper is hard put to it here.

<sup>16</sup> The "etc." is Tupper's. He quotes but the two lines.

<sup>17</sup> *Publications*, p. 104.

<sup>18</sup> *Publications*, p. 127.

<sup>19</sup> C, 288-91.

But our Host had only Jean de Meun and Gower to guide him—not “Chaucer, temp. 1914.” And “his strict confinement within the bounds of fourteenth-century thought” must be forgiven him.<sup>20</sup> Tupper’s remark about another interpretation of the Appius and Virginia story applies, I fear, *mutatis mutandis*, to his own: his “unhappy comment upon the moral of the story ignores utterly its traditional function.”<sup>21</sup>

<sup>20</sup> *Journal*, p. 553. Still another mediæval reader slipped up about the purport of the Tale—the scribe of the spurious Prologue to the *Physician’s Tale* in the Lansdowne MS. (*Oxford Chaucer*, III, p. 435): “As ye, worshipful Maister of Phisike, Tellith us *somme tale that is a cronyke*”—and on those terms the Physician complies. The scribe, who should have recognized the thing without a tag, somehow missed the point.

<sup>21</sup> *Notes*, p. 7, n. 13. Mr. Tupper lays great stress on “Virginia’s close resemblance to the ‘consecrated virgin’ ideal of patristic treatises” (*Publications*, p. 98, n. 7), especially as this ideal is elaborated in Ambrose’s *De Virginibus* (*Publications*, p. 104). This view is presented in detail in his latest article (*Notes*, pp. 5-7). I do not feel sure that Mr. Tupper’s parallels demonstrate the borrowings from Ambrose, but for the purpose of this argument I am perfectly willing to grant the point. Virginia is a virgin, wherever Chaucer got the hints for his description of her. His omnivorous reading may well have led him to Ambrose’s treatise, but the fact (if it be such) that he draws from it for Virginia has no real bearing upon Tupper’s case. Is the Prioress unchaste, because the description of her table manners is taken from the account which a lecherous old woman gives of women’s wiles? Is the first-night rapture of Troilus holy, because it finds expression in words drawn from the very Invocation to the Virgin which the Second Nun employs? Every student of Chaucer knows that the implications of his sources, as carried over to the use he makes of them, must be dealt with cautiously. It is probably a mere oversight that the example which Tupper cites from Jacques de Vitry (*Publications*, pp. 103-04) of “the mediæval moralizer turning him naturally to *father and mother*” is chosen from a sermon to boys and young men (Crane, p. xlvi).

## VI

In the case of the *Man of Law's Tale* Mr. Tupper has laid his stress upon the interpretation of the Prologue, and since his argument hinges almost wholly upon the significance of that puzzling document, it is best to deal with it first. I do not believe that his conclusions would follow, even if all his evidence could stand examination, but I am compelled to subject his arguments to closer scrutiny than I enjoy, because in them statement of fact is frequently vitiated by an admixture of tacit inference.

The Prologue is designated, when it is first referred to, as "a Poverty Prologue";<sup>1</sup> the next time it has become "the Poverty (or let us say, Envy) Prologue";<sup>2</sup> in "The Pardoners Tavern" it is "the Impatient Poverty (Envy) prologue,"<sup>3</sup> and the Poverty involved is defined as "more precisely, that Impatient Poverty which is traditionally associated with Envy";<sup>4</sup> in the *Nation* article it is "a prologue of Impatient Poverty, [which] is . . . a prologue of Envy,"<sup>5</sup> or (in the same article) "a prelude of Murmuration." Its stanzas, to be more explicit, illustrate "such a dominant phase of Envy as 'grucching' against one's wretched lot and 'sorwe of other mannes wele' (see *Parson's Tale*, 483, 498)."<sup>6</sup>

"Now Murmuration," Mr. Tupper tells us, "or 'grucching against poverty,' is one of the chief phases of Envy in

<sup>1</sup> *Publications*, p. 102.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 118.

<sup>3</sup> *Journal*, p. 565.

<sup>4</sup> *Journal*, p. 555.

<sup>5</sup> P. 41.

<sup>6</sup> *Journal*, p. 555. This properly substitutes Chaucer's "wele" for the misleading "wealth" of *Publications*, p. 103. But the plural "phases" should have been used, as "traits" is properly employed in the earlier article. The two faults mentioned are separate phases of Envy in the categories.

Chaucer's own *Parson's Tale*.<sup>7</sup> This is simply not the case. The identifying "or" is absolutely misleading, for although Murmuration in general is "one of the chief phases of Envy," "grucching against poverty" is *not*. It is one of six particulars under the first of two subheads of Murmuration, and it occupies less than one line out of the one hundred and twenty-nine lines of the section: "After bakbyting cometh grucching or murmuracioun; and somtyme it springeth of inpatience *agayns god*, and somtyme *agayns man*. *Agayns god it is*, whan a man gruccheth agayn *the peynes of helle*, or *agayns poverte*, or *los of catel*, or *agayn reyn or tempest*; or elles gruccheth *that shrewes han prosperitee*, or elles *for that goode men han adversitee*" (I, 498-500). Nor is Murmuration (including "grucching against poverty") one of the chief phases of Envy alone even in the *Parson's Tale*. The next sentence but one begins: "Somtyme comth grucching of *Avarice*"; the next but one: "Somtyme comth murmure of *Pryde*"; the next: "And somtyme grucching sourdeth of *Envye*"; the next but one: "Som tyme grucching comth of *ire*"—with five subheads.<sup>8</sup>

Moreover, this testimony of the crowning authority is borne out by the "categories." In the *Confessio Amantis* Murmur and Complaint are branches of *Pride*—"qui super omnes alios *Inobediencie* secreciores vt ministri illi deseruiunt":

For thogh fortune make hem wynne,  
*Yit grucchen thei*, and if thei lese,  
Ther is no weie for to chese,  
Wheroft heii myhten stonde appesed.  
So ben thei comunely desesed;  
Ther may no *welthe ne poverte*

<sup>7</sup> *Nation*, p. 41. Compare "such a dominant phase of Envy," above.

<sup>8</sup> See also above, p. 257.

Attempren hem to the decerte  
Of buxomnesse be no wise.<sup>9</sup>

Both “grueching” (*Groucer*) and murmuring are under Pride (Inobedience) in the *Mirour de l'Omme*.<sup>10</sup> This testimony represents Gower, on whose usage the import of the Tale depends. And Gower includes neither under Envy. Nor is it only Gower who includes them under Pride. Robert of Brunne does so too—and under precisely the same aspect (that of “grueching against God”) that is stressed by the Parson and the Man of Law:

3yf þou gruechedest, and seydyst noght,  
But to God haddyst euyl boght,  
Wete þou wel, hyt ys grete prydē,  
*Gruechynge with God*, or for to chyde.<sup>11</sup>

And Frère Lorens, like Gower, associates “murmures” with *Inobedience* (as well as with Sloth, Impatience, and Envy),<sup>12</sup> while the *Cursor Mundi* includes “grueching” under Pride.<sup>13</sup>

Furthermore, in the *Ayenbite*, “grueching” is included under *Wrath*:

Vor wreþe and felonye op-bereþ and nimþ zuo oþerhuyl þe herte  
of þe felle uor zome aduersite timlich . . . oþer uor zome misual  
þet his wyl ne is naȝt y-do: þet ha grocheþ aye oure Lhord.<sup>14</sup>

With still greater definiteness it appears under Wrath in *Jacob's Well*:

þe vij. fote of wose in wretthe is blasphemye; þat is, whanne þou  
gruechyst or spekyst aȝens god in tribulacyoun, in sykenes . . . &  
whanne þou demyst þat god ȝeuþt þe more wo & lesse wele þan  
þou were worthy to haue.<sup>15</sup>

<sup>9</sup> I, 1348-55.

<sup>10</sup> Ll. 2313 ff., 2323 ff.

<sup>11</sup> *Handlyng Synne*, ll. 3487-90 (under Pride).

<sup>12</sup> Eilers, p. 519.

<sup>13</sup> L. 28100.

<sup>14</sup> P. 30.

<sup>15</sup> P. 94. Cf. the *sixth* foot, “vnpacyence; þat is, whan þou gruechyst aȝens resounable chastysing,” etc. (See *Parson's Tale*, I, 498:

It is also, in *Jacob's Well*, one of the twenty-two inches of the gravel of misconduct that underlies the ooze of Wrath:

þe secunde inche of mysgouernaunce in þe mowth is *grucching*.  
As a carte-qweel, dry and vngrecyd, cryeth lowdest of oþere qwelys;  
So, þou drye & noȝt grecyd wyth grace *grucohyst* lowdest of alle  
oþere *azens* þi god in ony dysseſe & tribulacyoun.<sup>16</sup>

And it is one of the sixteen twigs of Wrath in Frère Lorens.<sup>17</sup>

“Gruuching” is the third point of *Sloth* in the *Ayenbite*<sup>18</sup> and in *Jacob's Well*,<sup>19</sup> and “Murmure” is the fifteenth twig of Sloth in Frère Lorens.<sup>20</sup> “Gruuching” is included under *Avarice* in the *Ayenbite*,<sup>21</sup> and also under Sins of the Tongue (*Gluttony*), where it has two boughs:

Vor þe on: is *grouchinge aye god*. and þe oþre aye man regneþ.  
þis zenne is in uele maneres ase . . . *ine poure*: *aye þe riche* . . .  
And wext þe grochinges . . . oþer of *onboȝsamnesse* . . . oþer ine  
*sleauþe* . . . oþer of *inpacienc* . . . oþer of *enuic*. oþer of *felonie*  
. . . *Grochinge aye god* heþ yet nou ynoȝ mo encheysouns . . . yef  
me him zent aduersete. *pouerte*. ziknesse. dyere time. rayn. druȝe  
. . . he him niymþ anhaste to *grochi aye god*.<sup>22</sup>

Finally, in *Jacob's Well* it is also treated in the chapter “*De gula et viciis lingue*,” where (as we have already seen)<sup>23</sup> it grows directly out of “the Devil's tavern”:

þis braunche hath ij. leuys: on is *grucchyng azens god*, anoþer is  
*azens man*. fferst *azens god*, for dyuerse skylles . . . þus þei grucche,  
ȝif god sende hem . . . *pouerte* . . . or ȝif god sende a man *werdly*

“Somtyme [grucching] springeth of *inpacienc*,” etc.; *Jacob's Well*, pp. 91, 100).

<sup>16</sup> P. 260.

<sup>17</sup> Eilers, p. 525.

<sup>18</sup> P. 34: “þe bridde is grochynge.”

<sup>19</sup> P. 112: “þe thridde fote is grucchyng.”

<sup>20</sup> Eilers, p. 535.

<sup>21</sup> P. 43: “þe oþer is þe zenne of grochinge and of traysoun.”

<sup>22</sup> Pp. 67-68.

<sup>23</sup> See above, p. 274.

*good, & take fro an-ōper his good. Panne þei seyn þat god is noȝt ryȝtwyse, & blamyn hym for his dede<sup>24</sup> . . . Also þei grueche aȝens man . . . as pore men aȝens ryche.<sup>25</sup>*

“Gruuching” does not appear under *Envy* at all in the *Confessio*, the *Mirour*, the *Ayenbite*, or *Jacob’s Well*. In the *Parson’s Tale*, Peraldus,<sup>26</sup> and Frère Lorens<sup>27</sup> it is explicitly associated, even in the treatment of Envy itself, with Avarice,<sup>28</sup> Pride,<sup>29</sup> Sloth,<sup>30</sup> and Wrath.<sup>31</sup> In Mr. Tupper’s own authorities it is only under Lechery that “this ‘gruuching’ or murmuring which characterizes every mention of [Impatient Poverty],”<sup>32</sup> does not appear. Yet we are told that “*every man of the Middle Ages must have recognized at once* the inherent fitness of prefacing a tale of Envy . . . with stanzas illustrating such a dominant phase of *Envy* as ‘gruuching’ against one’s wretched lot and ‘sorwe of other mannes wele.’”<sup>33</sup> Like Hudibras, presumably, “All this, without a gloss or comment, He could unriddle in a moment.” The truth is, the lines are not a “Poverty (let us say, *Envy*) Prologue” at all, any more than they are a “Poverty (let us say, *Pride, Sloth, Gluttony, or Wrath*) Prologue.” Mr. Tupper has overlooked the facts which I have given, and those facts are fatal to his interpretation of the Prologue. That is perhaps enough; but he has also failed to observe another interesting matter.

<sup>24</sup> “Thou blamest Crist, and seyst ful bitterly, *He misdeparteth richesse temporal*” (B, 106-07).

<sup>25</sup> P. 155.

<sup>26</sup> Petersen, pp. 47-48.

<sup>27</sup> Eilers, pp. 518-19.

<sup>28</sup> Parson and Peraldus.

<sup>29</sup> Parson, Peraldus, and (as Inobedience) Frère Lorens.

<sup>30</sup> Frère Lorens.

<sup>31</sup> Parson.

<sup>32</sup> Nation, p. 41.

<sup>33</sup> *Journal*, p. 555. “Sorwe of other mannes wele” is, to be sure, a phase of Envy, but the lines in the Prologue on which Mr. Tupper relies for this branch (B, 106-12) belong, as we shall see (pp. 316-17 below) in another category.

For one can readily make, on the basis of the admitted authorities themselves, a far stronger case for a *Wrath* than for an *Envy* Prologue. The phrase which Tupper finally adopts—"Impatient Poverty"—would give at once the clue to any mediæval reader alert for intimations of the Sins, for *Impatient* is itself a definite "tag." "Gruuching against God" (under which falls "grueching against poverty") is definitely assigned by the Parson to Impatience as its source: "Somtyme it springeth of *impacience* agayns god, and somtyme agayns man."<sup>34</sup> And Impatience is a subdivision of *Wrath* in the *Mirour de l'Omme*,<sup>35</sup> in *Jacob's Well*,<sup>36</sup> and in the *Pèlerinage*.<sup>37</sup> *Patience*, moreover, is the *remedium* for *Wrath* not only in the *Parson's Tale*,<sup>38</sup> but also in the *Confessio Amantis*,<sup>39</sup> and the *Mirour de l'Omme*.<sup>40</sup> Furthermore, as we have seen above,<sup>41</sup> "gruuching against God" is definitely associated with *Wrath*, even independently of Impatience, in the *Ayenbite* and *Jacob's Well*. And finally, we have the Man of Law's own testimony. Here is the second stanza, on which Mr. Tupper lays his emphasis:

Thou blamest Crist,<sup>42</sup> and seyst ful bitterly,<sup>43</sup>

<sup>34</sup> I, 498. Compare "And wext þe grochinges . . . of *inpaciencie*" (*Ayenbite*, p. 67); "murmur *Impacientie*" (Peraldus; Petersen, p. 48); "et naist cist murmures . . . de *inpaciencie*" (Frère Lorens; Eilers, p. 519); etc.

<sup>35</sup> Ll. 3953 ff.

<sup>36</sup> P. 94. Cf. p. 98, l. 31; p. 100, l. 1.

<sup>37</sup> Ll. 15691-98. *Wrath*'s saw is forged out of iron that "callyd was 'Inpacience' Wych was dolven out of helle, wher that blake ffendys dwelle."

<sup>38</sup> I, § 50-51.

<sup>39</sup> III, 612-713.

<sup>40</sup> Ll. 13381-14100.

<sup>41</sup> P. 312.

<sup>42</sup> Compare *Tale of Melibeus* under *Ire* (B, 2317): "'He that is irous and wrooth,' as seith Senek, 'ne may nat speke but he blame thinges'; and with his vicious wordes he stireth other folk to angre and to ire" (compare Tupper's own characterization [*Publications*,

He misdeparteth richesse temporal; “  
 Thy neighebour thou *wytest sinfully.*<sup>45</sup>  
 And seyst thou hast to lyte, and he hath al.  
 ‘ Parfay,’ scistow, ‘ sometyme he rekne shal,  
 Whan that his tayl shal brennen in the glede,  
 For he noght helpeth needfulle in hir nede.’<sup>46</sup>

Indeed, I know but one better characterization of these last lines than Mr. Tupper’s “vehement and vindictive,”<sup>47</sup> and that is the phrasing of their source. For the testimony of Innocent’s chapter<sup>48</sup> is clear: “*Proximum [mendi-*

p. 103] of this stanza as “at once vehement and vindictive”); *Parson’s Tale*, under *Ire* (I, 557): “Outrageous wratthe . . . spareth neither Crist, ne his swete mooder. And in his outrageous anger and Ire . . . ful many oon . . . feleth in his herte ful wikkedly, both of Crist and of alle hise halwes”; (I, 579): “Yet comen ther of Ire manye mo sinnes . . . as he that arretteth upon god, or *blameth god*”; and see especially above (p. 314) the quotation from *Jacob’s Well*, p. 155.

<sup>45</sup> Cf. I, 510: “Som tyme gruccing comth of *ire* . . . Thanne comth eek *bitternesse of herte.*”

<sup>46</sup> See the citations from *Jacob’s Well*, p. 94 (p. 312 above) and p. 155 (p. 314 above).

<sup>47</sup> See the whole section of the *Parson’s Tale* on “Chydinge and reproche” under Wrath (I, § 42), especially the portion (I, 623 ff.) which deals with him “that repreveth his neighebor.”

<sup>48</sup> B, 106-112.

<sup>49</sup> Cf. *Mirour de l’Omme* (under *Ire*), ll. 3961 ff.: “L’Inpacient envers tres tous Est *fel et trop contrariorus* . . . Et en response est *despitous.*”

Tupper does not point out that the chapter in the *De Contemptu Mundi* on which Chaucer here draws (Bk. I, cap. 14: “*De miseria pauperis et diuitiis*”) is *not* from that part of the treatise which deals with the Sins, namely, the *second* book. On the contrary, he definitely brings the passage into association, in his readers’ mind, with that discussion of the Sins. The fact that “Innocent’s famous tract, . . . which gives so large a space to the Vices, supplied him with Deadly Sins material in the Pardoners Prologue and Tale” is *not* of value “as an indication of his present purpose” (*Publications*, p. 103)—unless in drawing upon one part of a document Chaucer always meant to carry over into his specific borrowing the implications of every other portion of his source. Cf. also *Publications*, p. 118.

cans] *criminatur<sup>49</sup> malignum,<sup>50</sup> quod non plene subueniat. Indignatur, murmurat,<sup>51</sup> imprecatur.*"<sup>52</sup> What (it is pertinent under the theory to ask) was to prevent the mediæval mind from following this lead—the lead of the *Parson's Tale*, the *Confessio Amantis*, the *Mirour de l'Omme*, the *Ayenbite*, the *Pèlerinage*, *Jacob's Well*, Pope Innocent, and the Man of Law? It is a little hard to see.

And Mr. Tupper's own illustrations of the sort of thing that would guide aright every man of the Middle Ages (and with him us) through the maze towards *Envy* are not felicitously chosen. "According to the author of the 'Romance of the Rose' (ll. 826 ff.),<sup>53</sup> Poverty is the shame-faced spouse of misery, wedding a man to hate, and driving from him all friends and brethren."<sup>54</sup> But this is from a passage that has nothing to do with the Sins, and so far as it may be linked with them at all, the connection with *Wrath* is stronger than with *Envy*:

Povreté fait home despire,<sup>55</sup>  
Et hair.<sup>56</sup>

<sup>49</sup> Compare the Parson's "accusinge" (with reference to "his neighebor"), under "grucching [that] comth of ire or prive hate" (I, 508).

<sup>50</sup> Cf. "Thanne comth malignitee" (*ibid.*).

<sup>51</sup> See above, p. 312.

<sup>52</sup> I. e., "the Cursing phase of Wrath."

<sup>53</sup> The reference is wrong, even for Ellis's translation (*Temple Classics*, II, p. 27), from which it is taken. It should be (for Ellis) ll. 8360 ff. The reference for the French is ll. 8712 ff. (ed. Michel, I, p. 265).

<sup>54</sup> *Nation*, p. 41. This is chiefly Ellis. Jean de Meun has nothing about "the shamefaced spouse of misery." The lines so translated (ll. 8712-13; cf. Ellis, II, p. 27) are: "Povreté maint à l'autre chief, Plaine de honte et de meschief." He has nothing about "wedding a man to hate." The lines so translated (ll. 8738-39; cf. Ellis, II, p. 28) are : "Povreté fait home despire, Et hair et vivre à martire."

<sup>55</sup> *Despite* is incidentally mentioned under *Envy* in the *Parson's Tale* (I, 505); it is one of the stones of *Wrath* in the *Pèlerinage*

Nor is the next illustration happier. "In Lydgate's translation of De Guileville's "Pilgrimage of Human Life" (ll. 22716 ff.), Impatient Poverty is an ape-lipped crone . . . groaning and 'grucching.' It is this 'grucching or murmuring which characterizes every mention of the fault."<sup>57</sup> The treatment of Envy in the *Pèlerinage*<sup>58</sup> is singularly full and picturesque, but Impatient Poverty is not there. Deguileville's account of it comes *after* the adventures with the Sins, when Grace Dieu has brought the Pilgrim to the "castle" of the Cistercians, where Lady *Wilful Poverty* shows him the crone *Impatient Poverty*. And the outstanding fact about Impatient Poverty is her *Impatience*, not her "grucching."<sup>59</sup> It is because of her *Impatience* that she is the "ape-lipped crone":

That is thorough my Impacyence,  
And ffor lak of pacyence . . .  
That dothe my lypes hyghe reyse.<sup>60</sup>

And in the *Pèlerinage* Impatience stands explicitly for *Wrath*.<sup>61</sup> The passage from Hoccleve<sup>62</sup> is not accurately

(ll. 15680 ff.); it is more commonly a branch of *Pride* (*Parson's Tale*, *Mirour*, *Ayenbite*, *Jacob's Well*).

<sup>57</sup> Hate is a branch (commonly a main one) of Wrath in the *Parson's Tale*, the *Mirour*, the *Confessio*, the *Ayenbite*, *Jacob's Well*, Frère Lorens, and Peraldus. It is a branch of Envy in Raymund of Pennaforte (Petersen, p. 27).

<sup>58</sup> *Nation*, p. 41. We have already seen the wide provenience of "grucching."

<sup>59</sup> Ll. 14763-15500.

<sup>60</sup> See ll. 22741-46.

<sup>61</sup> Ll. 2257-61.

<sup>62</sup> Ll. 15691-98. There is still another direct association with *Wrath*. Compare the vivid account (ll. 22747-50, 22754-56) of Impatient Poverty as "the comune ape Affore ffolke to pleye and Iape" with the Parson's account of the *japeres* (*De Ira*, I, 650), "the develes apes," at whose "japerie" people laugh as "at the gaudes of an ape." The other sin with which Impatient Poverty associates itself, in this same passage in the *Pèlerinage*, is not Envy,

quoted. "Whoso grucheth in poverty, forfeiteth grace" should read: "And whoso gruchith, forfeith *þat* grace"—i. e., that grace "that he schuld han, if *þat his pacience* Withstode *þe* grief, and made it resistence" (ll. 1069-71). And the lines immediately preceding read: "Who-so it [Pouert] taketh *in pacient suffraunce*, It is ful pleasant beforne cristes face." That is precisely the Parson's remedy (not to mention Gower's) against *Wrath*.<sup>63</sup> Tupper's interpolation of "in poverty" (although a fair inference from the context), coupled with his serious omission of "that," gives something else than Hoccleve. To "forfeit grace" is a very definite thing—and the line from the *Regement* says nothing of it. As for the sixteenth-century Interlude of "Impatient Poverty,"<sup>64</sup> I can only say that two careful readings of the play itself have failed to disclose to me its bearing on the case. That may well be my own obtuseness, and I shall content myself here with observing that, although Mr. Tupper has quoted the Summoner's words to Impatient Poverty: "Ye be great slanderer, and full of *envy*,"<sup>65</sup> he has not quoted what Peace says to him: "Thou art so full of *Wrath* and *Envy*";<sup>66</sup> and that, although he has quoted one of Peace's injunctions: "Forsake *Envie* and *Misrule*,"<sup>67</sup> he has left out another: "*Haunt no taverns . . . Let not hassard*

but *Sloth*: "I love no maner *besynessee*, But oonly *slouthe* and *ydennesse*" (ll. 22765-66). Compare the association of Impatience with Sloth in the *Ayenbite* (p. 33) and *Jacob's Well* (p. 112).

<sup>63</sup> *Regement of Princes* (E. E. T. S.), p. 39 (*Nation*, p. 41). The passage "in Lydgate's version of Aesop" (for which no reference is given either) I have not found.

<sup>64</sup> See above, p. 315.

<sup>65</sup> *Nation*, p. 41.

<sup>66</sup> Early English Dramatists ("Lost" Tudor Plays), ed. Farmer, p. 342.

<sup>67</sup> P. 318.

<sup>68</sup> P. 346.

nor rioter with you be checkmate”<sup>68</sup>—which (as we learn from “The Pardoner’s Tavern”) means *Gluttony*.<sup>69</sup> I am using Mr. Tupper’s own evidence alone, and I am willing to leave the conclusion to the impartial scholar.

We may now come to the element of *irony*. The case for the ironical contrast between teller and tale rests upon two assumptions. “The Poverty Prologue . . . shows us clearly that the narrator of this story of Envy is *himself tainted by that Sin*.<sup>70</sup> This evidence is ample for our present purpose. But it is noteworthy that from the point of view of Chaucer’s day, there was an ironical fitness in the final assignment of an Envy tale to the Man of Law,<sup>71</sup> whose profession in the fourteenth century was tainted by *Envy* as well as by *Avarice*.<sup>72</sup> The Man of Law is envious, then, first, because the Prologue shows that he is; second, because he is a member of an envious profession. As regards the first, we may waive, for the moment, the objections to the Prologue as exemplifying

<sup>68</sup> P. 320.

<sup>69</sup> See above, p. 267. It is perfectly easy to show that in the Interlude the tradition which has survived is that of *Impatience*. See, for example, pp. 316, 319, etc.

<sup>70</sup> Compare *Publications*, 118: “Chaucer adheres to the ironical design . . . by making *an envious man* (the anonymous speaker of the Prologue, later identified with the Man of Law merely through the context) furnish in his narrative large evidence against Envy.” Compare *Nation*, p. 41: “The cry of *Chaucer’s envious man*, ‘O riche marchaunts,’ ” etc.

<sup>71</sup> I shall not dwell on the difficulty (which Mr. Tupper takes lightly) involved in the “final assignment” (see also the parenthetical statement in the preceding note above) of “this derelict tale” (Tatlock, *Development and Chronology*, p. 188). As Mr. Tupper himself points out (*Nation*, Oct. 16, 1913, p. 355), “the tale of Constance . . . was inserted here, apparently, as an afterthought.” It should not be forgotten that the theory has already one “afterthought” to carry, in the *Second Nun’s Tale*.

<sup>72</sup> *Publications*, p. 110. Cf. *Nation*, p. 41, fifth paragraph, end.

Envy, and assume that Mr. Tupper's interpretation is so far correct. Even granting that, it ceases at this point to be so. For the *speaker* of the Prologue *is not himself "gruccing against poverty" at all.* He is *addressing Poverty*,<sup>73</sup> and his point of view is that of one who holds the "hateful harm" up to reprobation *because it leads to "gruccing."*<sup>74</sup> It is *not* the point of view of one who "is himself tainted by that Sin." If the Prologue shows anything whatever about the Man of Law, it shows precisely the reverse of Mr. Tupper's contention.

As for the second point, Mr. Tupper is very hard put to it for his testimony. The association of lawyers with *Avarice* is (as he recognizes) a familiar one.<sup>75</sup> To demonstrate that the profession was regarded as "tainted by *Envy*," he cites the following evidence.<sup>76</sup> (i) Gower's use, to describe the Lawyer (*Vox*, vi, 293), of "the same image of the Basilisk that he employs to picture Envy (*Mirour*, 3748 f.)." There is no reference to the basilisk in *Vox*, vi, 293, nor elsewhere in the chapter, which deals explicitly (see its title, and l. 302) with the *Avarice* of lawyers,

<sup>73</sup> "Thou blamest . . . thou wytest . . . 'Parfay,' seistow"—and so on.

"This, of course, is Innocent's attitude too ("O miserabilis mendicantis conditio," etc.).

"Not only does it appear in most of the categories (see, for instance, *Ayenbite*, p. 40; *Jacob's Well*, p. 131; *Handlyng Synne*, p. 177; *Mirour*, ll. 6329 ff.; etc.), but it is of constant occurrence elsewhere. See *Sermones Aurei*, II, p. 236: "Quadruplex est lex. Prima est lex cupiditatis, quae est *Advocatorum*"; Wyclif, ed. Arnold, III, p. 153: "Bot men of lawe and marchauntis . . . synnen more in avarice þen done pore laboreres"; *Roman de la Rose*, l. 5812 (ed. Michel, I, p. 170; cf. Chaucerian Frag.-B, ll. 5721-23), on *advocates* and *physicians*; etc. Avarice herself becomes an advocate in the *Pèlerinage* (ll. 18244 ff.), and the long section in the *Mirour* (ll. 24817-25176) on the "gens de loy" offers abundant evidence. These are merely representative examples.

<sup>76</sup> *Publications*, p. 110, n. 35.

as do the two preceding sections also. Anyway, the *Parson* uses the basilisk (I, 852) to illustrate the covetousness of *Lechery*. (ii) Hoccleve's comparison (*Regement of Princes*, 2815 f.) "of the Law to the venomous spider, which catches little flies, and lets big ones go." "Venomous" (which is a word that connotes Envy—and the only thing in the passage which does) is Mr. Tupper's own interpolation; it is not in Hoccleve.<sup>77</sup> The reason for this is good; *cobwebs* are not venomous. Tupper has been misled by Furnivall's gloss.<sup>78</sup> The simile of the *spider* is used for *Avarice* in the *Pèlerinage*.<sup>79</sup> (iii) Langland's making Envy instruct friars "to lerne logik and lawe" (C. xxiii, 273). Yes, "and eke *contemplacioun*, And preche men of Plato and prouen hit by Seneca." Did the Clerk of Oxford, "that un-to *logik* hadde long y-go," and St. Cecilia, "[quae] fuit . . . coelum per jugem *contemplationem*" also exemplify Envy? Mr. Tupper's logic inexorably requires it. (iv) The testimony of Bromyard of Hereford, which I have not been able to verify. (v) "The sorry part played by 'Civile' or Civil Law in *Piers Plowman*." I suppose that this sorry part is the fact that "Civile" is throughout associated with *Simony*, a branch of *Avarice*.<sup>80</sup>

<sup>77</sup> P. 102, ll. 2819-21: "Riȝt as lop-webbys, flyes smale and gnattes taken, and suffre grete flyes go, ffor al þis worlde, lawe is now rewlyd so."

<sup>78</sup> For "lop-webbe" see *Astrolabe*, I, 21, 3: "The Riet of thyn Astrolabie with thy zodiak, shapen in maner of a net or of a *loppe-webbe*." For "loppe," see I, 19, 3: "crokede strykes lyk to the clawes of a *loppe*"; I, 3, 4: "a webbe of a *loppe*."

<sup>79</sup> Ll. 17560 ff.: "And as an yreyne sowketh the flye," etc. It is Avarice herself who is speaking, with reference to her treatment of the poor.

<sup>80</sup> "Symonye and Cyuile" (B, II, 62, 66, 71, 167, 168); "And preide Cyuile to se · and Symonye to rede it" (70); "Bi siȝte of sire Symonye · and Cyules leve" (113); "Here-to assenteth Cyuile · ac Symonye ne wolde" (141). See Book II, *passim*.

(vi) This, and many passages in Gower and Wyclif, "prove that the legal profession was then infected by covetousness of wealth and *contempt for poverty*—by Avarice intermingled with *Envy*." No, with *Pride*!! "It is noteworthy that Gower classes the *contempt . . . for the poor and humble* under the *Inobedience phase of Pride*, just as Chaucer does here [in the *Wife of Bath's Tale*]."<sup>81</sup> That is Tupper, deplorably divided against himself. (vi) "The advocate is the butt of many *exempla* in such example-books as Jacques de Vitry's and the *Liber Exemplorum*." True; but one is still to be cited which associates him with *Envy*. I can only say that I have not found it.—In his *Nation* article Mr. Tupper speaks of "Chaucer's final ascription of the prologue of Murmuration . . . to the Man of Law as an exponent of Envy [as] vindicated by the many mediæval illustrations of the unfavorable conception of this supposedly envious profession presented in [his] article on 'Chaucer and the Seven Deadly Sins.'" We have seen "the many mediæval illustrations." And I accept Mr. Tupper's own phrase regarding the "*supposedly envious profession*." For all that has been shown, it is only that and nothing more. The irony, as Mr. Tupper sees it, has no basis whatsoever in the facts.

I do not know whether the next point falls under the head of irony or not. In any case, the theory (in the eyes of which it now begins to seem that all the world's but Sins, and all the men and women merely Vices) is not content with drawing lawyers under the heading *De Invidia*, but must needs hale merchants thither too. "It is no chance coincidence with Chaucer that Envy in the

<sup>81</sup> *Publications*, p. 101. "It is a chief phase of *Pride* to scorn the poor," Tupper goes on (n. 16), and cites Langland's "*povete to despise*" (B. II, 79) in his support. To make assurance double sure, he repeats this slip in the *Nation*, p. 41. See below, p. 324.

Elizabethan interlude makes large mention of *merchants* and men of law. Both of these occupations were deemed by men of the Middle Ages to be tainted with a base desire for wealth and a sovereign contempt for the poor.<sup>82</sup> "A base desire for wealth" is *Avarice*: "a sovereign contempt for the poor" (*teste* Mr. Tupper and the categories) is *Pride*.<sup>83</sup> But of that no fors. As for Envy's "large mention" of merchants in the Interlude, I shall only ask my readers to look up the evidence for themselves.<sup>84</sup> Envy is merely pointing out, in a passage-at-arms with Peace, that both merchants and lawyers are gainers by strife, and (in a similar tilt with Conscience) that both would hang Conscience, could they catch him. But Mr. Tupper cites two more examples "of a score." The first is from Wyclif, in his sermon against Envy (III, p. 133): "And so uneven dealing of goods of this world engenders much envy among these worldly men."<sup>85</sup> And so parts of this community<sup>86</sup> and especially merchants move to this envy by deceit of their craft."<sup>87</sup> Are merchants therefore envious because their happier state moves others to Envy? As for "the rich merchants who but live to gain more wealth," in the *Romance of the Rose*, that is all Ellis<sup>88</sup> except "mer-

<sup>82</sup> *Nation*, p. 41.

<sup>83</sup> See above, p. 323.

<sup>84</sup> *Impatient Poverty*, pp. 314-15, 327-28.

<sup>85</sup> I. e., "þo þridge part of þe chirche" ("þo laboreres," "þo puple," "pore men of þo comyne"). The subject of Wyclif's chapter is the causes of envy among the laity, as contrasted with priests and knights.

<sup>86</sup> Rather, "commonalty, the commons, the laity."

<sup>87</sup> "Deceite bitwixe merchant and merchant" is under *Avarice* in the *Parson's Tale* (I, 776). Compare the whole section on "Chaffer" (under *Avarice*) in the *Ayenbite* (pp. 44-45); the section on "fals marchaundyse" (under *Avarice*) in *Jacob's Well* (pp. 133-34); *Handlyng Synne*, ll. 5945-50; etc.

<sup>88</sup> *Temple Classics*, I, p. 177. For the text, see ed. Michel, I, p. 166, ll. 5703-07.

chants." It is from a conventional account of the "tribulations of the rich," and even Ellis understood it aright, for his translation goes straight on: "what miseries they are fain To undergo with will to pile Riches on riches; avarice vile Hath seized their hearts," etc. The Chaucerian translator (a "man of the Middle Ages") also understood it so, with his "*gredinesse.*"<sup>89</sup> The passage has not the slightest connection with *Envy*. As usual, it is *Avarice* that is involved.<sup>90</sup> In a word, merchants and men of law alike (indubitably classed together in many mediæval documents) were "deemed by men of the Middle Ages to be tainted with" *Avarice*. The addition of *Envy* is unsupported by the facts.

What, in this case, of the "crowning argument?" "Why should we hesitate to regard the Poverty Prologue to the Man of Law's Envy *exemplum*<sup>91</sup> as a studied presentation of the Envious mood,<sup>92</sup> when the Parson himself assures us that the *motif* of these stanzas, 'grueching against poverty' and 'sorwe of other mannes wele' are among the chief traits<sup>93</sup> of this Vice?"<sup>94</sup> This rests entirely on Mr. Tupper's previous contentions, and stands or falls with them. Its upshot is a statement that the Par-

<sup>89</sup> B-Fragment, ll. 5590-5600. Compare also *Roman de la Rose*, ed. Michel, I, p. 169 (ll. 5792 ff.), where the connection with *Avarice* becomes still more explicit, and goes on to include (ll. 5812 ff.) advocates, physicians, and preachers. See the B-Fragment, ll. 5697 ff.

<sup>90</sup> For the *Avarice* of merchants, see above, p. 324, n. 87, and add Wyclif (ed. Arnold), III, p. 153: "þo þridde part of þo Chirche . . . hafþ mony partis smytted wiþ avarice, and specially marchaudis"; *Vox Clamantis*, Bk. v, chaps. xii-xiv; *Mirour de l'Omme*, ll. 25177-25980; Barclay, II, p. 169 (foot); etc. But the point is too obvious to need illustration.

<sup>91</sup> For this, see below, p. 326.

<sup>92</sup> See above, p. 311.

<sup>93</sup> See above, p. 321.

<sup>94</sup> *Publications*, p. 116.

son's sermon on the Seven Deadly Sins includes a discussion of Envy.

"This is," indeed, "a long preamble of a tale"! But we may now turn to "the Envy *exemplum*" itself, to wit, the Tale of Constance. In Gower it is used to exemplify Detraction.<sup>95</sup> That is indubitable. But Gower (it is equally indubitable) is merely impressing into the service of his vast schematic plan a tale which has no necessary association whatever with the Sins, but which, on the contrary, has a long and honorable career apart from them.<sup>96</sup> In that development, except for Gower's *ad hoc* employment of the tale, it is the figure of Constance that consistently stands out. And when Mr. Tupper says<sup>97</sup> that "the *Man of Law's Tale*, though primarily of Envy (as the little Prologue shows) exalts the loyalty and strength of the stately wife and mother," his theory has led him to a *hysteron proteron*. But since I am scrupulously refraining, in this paper, from all direct consideration of Chaucer's art, in my sole concern with the foundations of a theory, I shall not dwell on what seems to me to have been Chaucer's emphasis.

Instead, since I now know the Sins myself almost as well as my Paternoster and even better than my Creed, I shall offer myself as a fair substitute for the mediæval

<sup>95</sup> It is, of course, Detraction in *love* (see gloss to II, 587 ff.). Mr. Tupper is mistaken, however, if he supposes that Detraction is a *Merkmal* of Envy alone. It is a "spyce" of *Pride* in *Handlyng Synne* (p. 122); the Parson includes it (as a phase of spiritual homicide) under *Wrath* (I, 565); and in *Jacob's Well* it is classed under *Gluttony*, as a Sin of the Tongue (p. 150; cf. *Ayenbite*, p. 62).

<sup>96</sup> See especially Siefkin, *Das geduldige Weib in der englischen Literatur bis auf Shakspere*: Teil I: Der Konstanzetypus (Rathenow, 1903).

<sup>97</sup> *Publications*, pp. 122-23. Cf. *Nation*, Oct. 16, 1913, p. 355.

adept in the categories. And as such I conceive the Tale of Constance, guided wholly by the manuals that I know, in a fashion very different from Mr. Tupper's interpretation. For to my mediaeval prototype the heroine's very name must have betrayed her import. Cecilia was the antitype of Sloth; Virginia the antitype of Lechery; here is a tale in which another noble central figure stands for "*Constaunce*, that is, stableness of corage . . . in herte by stedefast feith, and in mouth, and in beringe, and in chere and in dede."<sup>98</sup> She is, indeed, own sister to St. Cecilia, for Constance is a branch of that Fortitude which (in the theory) Cecilia represents.<sup>99</sup> Constance is a main division of Prouesse in the *Mirour*;<sup>100</sup> it is the fifth step of Prouesse in the *Ayenbite*;<sup>101</sup> the fifth part of Proesce in Frère Lorens;<sup>102</sup> the fifth part of Fortitudo in the *Summa Virtutum*;<sup>103</sup> in all it is the antitype of *Sloth*. And Chaucer's own interpolation in the Tale (ll. 932-45) is explicit in its emphasis on this high virtue:

How may this wayke womman han this *strengthe* . . .<sup>104</sup>  
 Who yaf Judith *corage* or *hardinesse* . . .<sup>105</sup>  
 . . . I seye, for this entente,

---

<sup>98</sup> *Parson's Tale*, I, 735—under Fortitude, the remedy for *Sloth*.

<sup>99</sup> See above, p. 298. And compare Siefkin (pp. 23, 76), who links the two together.

<sup>100</sup> Ll. 14317 ff.

<sup>101</sup> Pp. 167-68.

<sup>102</sup> Eilers, p. 570.

<sup>103</sup> Petersen, p. 66, n. 1.

<sup>104</sup> A vertu that is called *Fortitudo* or *Strengthe*" (I, § 60). In the *Ayenbite* (pp. 161 ff.) Prowess is designated as "þe yefþe of *Strengþe*."

<sup>105</sup> "Constaunce, that is, stableness of *corage*" (I, § 61); "Prowesse is huanne *corage* onworþþ al þet ne is naȝt in his pouer" (*Ayenbite*, p. 164); "Ac huanne god yefþ to þe manne þise grace . . . þet me clepeþ þe gost of *strengþe*. he hym yefþ ane newe herte ane noble herte and hardi . . . Hardyesse uor to bolie alle þe kueadnesse þet þe wordle may þreapni" (*ibid.*, p. 162); "þis ground of *strengthe* or *hardynesse*" (*Jacob's Well*, p. 288).

That, right as god spirit of vigour sente  
To hem, and saved hem out of meschance,  
So sent he *might and vigour* to Custance.<sup>106</sup>

Could the mediæval reader go astray? <sup>107</sup> Constance, like Cecilia, is the antitype of Sloth. And see, now, with what exquisite aptness the Impatient Poverty Prologue is adjusted to the Tale. For Impatience is a *branch* of Sloth! <sup>108</sup> Tale and Prologue fit each other like hand and glove—a Prologue of “*inpaciencie agayns god*”; <sup>109</sup> a Tale of that “*pacience. be [which] uirtue þe guode ouer-comþ alle his uyendes. þane dyeuel. þe wordle. and þet uless.*” <sup>110</sup> Nor has Chaucer left us without other unequivocal indications of his purpose. Even *Cecilia’s* “*bisinesse*” was not so marked as that of Constance:

She was *so diligent, with-outen slouthe* ...  
That alle hir loven that loken on hir face.<sup>111</sup>

And as in the Second Nun’s Prologue, so in the *Man of Law’s Tale* we have “the most effective sort of protest against Sloth in its phase of *Undevotion*. ” Only this time it is not a nameless prologist, but the central figure of the

<sup>106</sup> “This vertu [Fortitudo] is *so mighty and so vigorous*, that it dar withstonde mightily,” etc. (I, § 60). Cf. *Jacob’s Well*, p. 289: “*þe yfte of strengthe, whiche yfte schal make þe strong and mysty to dure.*”

<sup>107</sup> Is not Tupper himself among those who see the light and know it not? Constance “achieves in the end the high reward of her *strength and loyalty*” (*Nation*, Oct. 16, 1913, p. 355); the Tale “exalts the loyalty and *strength* of the stately wife and mother” (*Publications*, p. 123).

<sup>108</sup> “*þe oþer poynt [of Sleüþe] is inpaciencie*” (*Ayenbite*, p. 33); “*þe secunde fote brede [of Accidia] is vnpaciencie*” (*Jacob’s Well*, p. 112). And “*inpaciencie*” is the fourteenth twig of Sloth in Frère Lorens (*Eilers*, p. 535).

<sup>109</sup> I, 497.

<sup>110</sup> *Ayenbite*, p. 167—under “*þe uerþe stape of Prouesse.*”

<sup>111</sup> B, 530, 532.

Tale herself, who employs "the antidote against Sloth." For Constance uses Hymns *both* of our Lord and of our Lady. Her address to the Cross<sup>112</sup> is a cento of reminiscences of the first.<sup>113</sup> The "Invocacio ad Mariam"<sup>114</sup>—once more on Constance's own lips—is full of phrases from the second. And we have our Idleness Prologue, too! Only this time it is no accident. It is the Master of Ceremonies himself who, *in calling on the speaker*, gives him his *motif*:

'Lordinges, the tyme wasteth night and day,  
And steleth from us, what *prively slepinge*,  
And what *thurgh negligence* in our wakinge,  
As dooth the streen, that turneth never agayn . . .  
*Lat us nat moulen thus in ydeinsse.*  
Sir man of lawe,' quod he, 'so have ye blis,  
Tel us a tale anon, as forward is.'<sup>115</sup>

"Who can miss the present purport of the Idleness [lines], or ignore the formal intent of [Constance's] zest of devotion?"<sup>116</sup> Even the subtlest sort of *irony* is present too. For of whom but the Man of Law has Chaucer said:

No-ther so bisy a man as he ther nas,  
*And yet he semed bisier than he was.*<sup>117</sup>

Nor does the "crowning argument" this time desert us; the notable correspondence between the "Fortitude stanzas"<sup>118</sup> and the Parson's *remedium* against Sloth is

<sup>112</sup> B, 451-462. "O clere, o welful auter, holy croys," etc.

<sup>113</sup> Before Mr. Tupper's article was written I had collected the evidence for this statement, which I may some day print. The hymn which Skeat quotes (*Oxford Chaucer*, v, p. 155) is only one of several involved.

<sup>114</sup> B, 841-54. "Moder" quod she, "and mayde bright, Marye . . . Thou haven of refut, brighte sterre of day," etc.

<sup>115</sup> B, 20-23, 32-34.

<sup>116</sup> *Publications*, pp. 115-16.

<sup>117</sup> A, 321-22.

<sup>118</sup> B, 932-45 above.

unmistakable. The *Second Nun's Tale* itself is not so unequivocally "tagged." The Host's Idleness Prologue, the Man of Law's Impatience (let us say, Sloth) Prologue, the Fortitude Tale (with Constance's "bisinesse" and her protest against Undevotion), the element of irony, and the crowning argument all unite in one entire and perfect chrysolite.—"Glosinge is a glorious thing, certeyn"!<sup>119</sup>

## VII

We need not dwell so long upon the *Manciple's Tale*, the illustration of the Sin of *Chiding*. "Gower tells very briefly (*Confessio*, III, 783-817), the story of Phoebus and Cornis, to illustrate *Chiding or Cheste*, the second of his divisions of Wrath. We shall see that *his moral is exactly the same as Chaucer's*, who derives his story directly from *Ovid*."<sup>1</sup> Tupper's view is here given in a nutshell. Let us examine it.

First, "Cheste" is not necessarily "Chiding" at all. The heading of the section in the *Confessio* begins: "Ira mouet *litem*, que lingue frena resoluens Laxa per infames currit vbique vias."<sup>2</sup> The gloss begins: "Hic tractat Confessor super secunda specie Ire, que *Lis* dicitur." The story of Socrates is an "exemplum de pacientia in amore *contra lites* habenda."<sup>3</sup> The tale of Jupiter, Juno, and Tiresias is an "exemplum, quod *de alterius*

<sup>119</sup> I shall not take the trouble to shatter this creation of my own. "It is a pratty childe," as Mak's wife says of the *ci-devant* sheep. So are they all—these changelings left of late with Chaucer by the Seven Deadly Sins.

<sup>1</sup> *Publications*, p. 99, n. 12.

<sup>2</sup> III, between lines 416 and 417.

<sup>3</sup> Opposite III, 639 ff. See "*strif*" in l. 650.

*lite intromittere cauendum est.”<sup>4</sup>* The gloss to the tale of Phoebus and Cornis begins: “Quia *litigantes* ora sua cohibere nequidunt.”<sup>5</sup> *Lis*, of course, is “strife, dispute, quarrel.” Nor is Gower less explicit in his employment of the English word: “To fyhte or for to make cheste”;<sup>6</sup> “So is ther noght bot *strif and cheste*.”<sup>7</sup> And so Macaulay properly defines “Cheste” as “contention (in words).” Its use in *Piers Plowman* is similar,<sup>8</sup> and Skeat defines it as “strife, quarrelling.” Murray defines it as “strife, contention, quarrelling,” and cites *Ælfric* (where it glosses *Seditio*), and the *Ancren Riwle* (“cheaste oþer *Strif*”). “Cheaste” in the *Ayenbite*<sup>9</sup> has seven branches: “Strif, chidinge, missiginge, godelinge, atwytinge, þreapninge, vnonynge.” “Cheste” may include Chiding<sup>10</sup> (and a variety of other things), but to identify Chiding with Cheste is to deal freely with facts—and also to plunge headlong into difficulties.

For the point of Gower’s discussion of Cheste is clear. It is the fact that Cheste “berth evere his mowth unpinned”:<sup>11</sup>

For as a Sive keþeth Ale,  
Riht so can Cheste kepe a tale.<sup>12</sup>

That is the point not only of the section in general, but

<sup>4</sup> Opposite III, 736 ff. The tale itself begins: “Yit cam ther nevere good of *strif*.”

<sup>5</sup> Opposite III, 783 ff.

<sup>7</sup> v, 541.

<sup>6</sup> *Prologue*, l. 215.

<sup>8</sup> See, for instance, C. I, 103-08.

<sup>9</sup> Pp. 65-67 (Sins of the Tongue). Richard Morris also translates it *Strife*, in both his heading and his gloss (see p. 65).

<sup>10</sup> Wyclif (cited by Murray) translates *James*, iv, 1 (“Unde bella et *lites* in vobis?”): “Wherof bateyles and *cheestes*, or *chidinges*, among *þou*? ” The Parson (who does not include it under “Chydinge,” I, § 42) is somewhat ambiguous: “Thanne stant the sinne of contumelie or *stryf* and *cheeste*” (I, 555).

<sup>11</sup> III, 424. Compare also the Latin verses at the head of the section.

<sup>12</sup> III, 433-34.

of the tale of Phoebus and Cornis in particular, which is an “exemplum contra illos qui in amoris causa *alterius consilium reuelare presumunt.*”<sup>13</sup> It has nothing to do with Chiding. This Tupper evidently sees. For when he comes to his “crowning argument,” he refers us to the “Parson’s sermon, *in its section upon Wrath* (I, 647 f.)”<sup>14</sup> The part of the section referred to (I, 647 f.) is the discussion of “*ydel wordes*” (§ 47)<sup>15</sup>—not *chiding* at all. The discussion of “*Chydinge and reproche*” is § 42. Furthermore, Mr. Tupper tells us that “it is interesting to compare the Manciple’s lines (H, 343 f.)” on *Jangling* “with the Parson’s words on the same theme (I, 648).”<sup>16</sup> The comparison is perfectly apt, but I, 648 is yet another subhead of Wrath. “*Chydyng and reproche . . . scorninge . . . wikked conseil . . . discord . . . double tongue . . . biwreying of conseil . . . manace . . . ydel wordes . . . janglinge*” (I, 648)—so the

<sup>13</sup> Gloss (III, 783 ff.). See also the introductory lines, quoted below, p. 334, n. 23.

<sup>14</sup> *Publications*, p. 102.

<sup>15</sup> “Biwreying of conseil” immediately precedes (§ 47).

<sup>16</sup> *Publications*, p. 102, n. 19. It is also interesting to compare the Manciple’s lines on *Jangling* “with the Parson’s words on the same theme” in I, 405: “*Janglinge, is when men speken to muche biforn folk, and clappen as a mille, and taken no kepe what they seye.*” But that is *Pride*. (Compare also *Cursor Mundi*, ll. 27620-22; *Pèlerinage*, 14414). It is still further interesting to compare what Gower himself says (*Confessio*, II, 398, 425, 452-54) about *jangling* in affairs of love (the Manciple’s own theme), especially the lover’s conclusion:

*I telle it noght to ten ne tuelve,*  
*Theroft I wol me wel avise,*  
*To speke or *jangle* in eny wise*  
*That toucheth to my ladi name (II, 524-27).*

But that is *Envy*. The interest grows when we compare *Piers Plowman*, B. II, 93-94: “*And alday to drynke. at dyuerse tauernes, And there to iangle and to iape.*” But that is *Gluttony*. See below, p. 341.

branches run. We are given no evidence for *Chiding* whatsoever. When Mr. Tupper states (in applying the argument from correspondence with the *Parson's Tale*) that the Manciple "concludes his tale of *Chiding* by a copious use of the Parson's words *against that fault*,"<sup>17</sup> he is running counter to the facts. To argue that a Tale exemplifies one branch of Wrath, because it exemplifies two other branches, comes very near what Mr. Tupper himself has called a "perverted endeavor to adapt false premises to a conclusion that admits of large doubt."<sup>18</sup>

But there is the *moral* of the Tale. The moral in Gower is "exactly the same as Chaucer's." The moral which Tupper quotes, however, is *not*, as it happens, the *moral of the story of Phoebus and Cornis*. It follows the *next* tale, that of Jupiter and Laar. The moral of the tale of Phoebus is as follows:

Be war therfore and sei the beste,  
If thou wolt be thiself in reste,  
Mi goode Sone, as I the rede.<sup>19</sup>

And the story of Jupiter and Laar has its own application too:

And suche adaires be now fele  
In loves Court, as it is seid,  
That lete here tunges gon unteid.<sup>20</sup>

What Tupper quotes is the "application" of the whole section on *Cheste*:

Mi Sone, be thou non of tho,  
To jangle and telle tales so,  
And namely that thou ne chyde,  
For Cheste can no conseil hide,  
For Wraththe seide nevere wel.<sup>21</sup>

<sup>17</sup> *Publications*, p. 116.

<sup>18</sup> *Publications of the Modern Language Association*, xxvi, p. 236.

<sup>19</sup> III, 815-17.

<sup>20</sup> III, 828-30.

<sup>21</sup> III, 831-35.

Even apart from the question of the validity of the evidence we are asked to accept, the slip is an unfortunate one. For the reference to *Chiding* harks back to another part of the section. Gower, of course, like Dan Michel, makes mention of Chiding *under Cheste*,<sup>22</sup> and the summary includes that. It is not, however, the phase of Cheste which the story of Phoebus and Cornis exemplifies at all. That is summed up in "To jangle and telle tales so. . . . *For Cheste can no conseil hide.*"<sup>23</sup> Even waiving the implications of the error, however, we are no better off. Let us assume that the lines which Tupper quotes are the moral of the tale of Phoebus and the crow. This moral, then, is (according to Tupper) "exactly the same is the fact that the crucial words "chide" or "chiding" the "exactness" of the correspondence between the two"<sup>24</sup> is the fact that the crucial words "chide" or "chiding" do not occur in the Manciple's "application" at all, nor do they appear in his Tale from beginning to end. The only point where the two morals do come together is in their insistence on the evils of *jangling* and of *telling tales*—and those are two other branches of Wrath. The theme of the Manciple's "morality," both implicitly and explicitly (see ll. 343, 348, 350), is, of course, *jangling*. It begins with the crow ("My sone, thenk on the crowe, a goddes name") and it ends with the crow ("Kepe wel

<sup>22</sup> See III, 472-77, and cf. 443, 492, 534, 552, 565, 575, 580, 591.

<sup>23</sup> See especially the correspondence with the second line of the *introduction* to the tale of Phœbus: "Hold conseil and descoevre it noght, *For Cheste can no conseil hele*, Or be it wo or be it wele: And tak a tale into thi mynde, The which of olde ensample I finde" (II, 778-82)—and the "olde ensample" is the tale of the crow. See also the gloss, quoted above, p. 332. The moral of the next tale (the "tunges unteid") has been given above.

<sup>24</sup> The one (it may be observed) has *five*, the other *fifty-three* lines.

thy tonge, and thenk up-on the crowe "'), and all between is in keeping with that. If Chaucer meant the *Manciple's Tale* to exemplify Chiding, he was singularly careless in affixing his "moral tags to the tale."<sup>25</sup>

And in any case, Chiding, like the other branches, is something of a will-o-the-wisp among the Sins. Mr. Tupper remarks that Langland too deems *Chiding* one of the divisions of *Wrath*.<sup>26</sup> The lines in question are as follows:

And the erldome of *envye* · and *wratthe* *togidres*,  
With the chastelet of *chest* · and *chaterying-out-of-resoun*.

The identification of Chiding and Cheste<sup>27</sup> we have already seen to be incorrect. And of the two Sins mentioned, it is *Envye*, not Wrath, that claims Chiding proper in *Piers Plowman*:

Eche a word that he [Enuy] warpe · was of an addres tonge,  
Of *chydynge* and of *chalangynge* · was his chief lyfode.<sup>28</sup>

Moreover, Chiding is a "spyce" of *Pride* in *Handlyng Synne*.<sup>29</sup> In the same document,<sup>30</sup> and also in *Jacob's Well*,<sup>31</sup> it is included under *Gluttony*. As Mr. Chambers remarks, with reference to the branches of *Wrath*: "If it is objected that we have already had these sins under *Pride*, that is to be ascribed . . . to *Mediæval Theology*."<sup>32</sup> And it is just what William James would have called the "blooming welter" of Mediæval Theology that Mr. Tupper refuses to take into account. When we consider the

<sup>25</sup> *Publications*, p. 119.

<sup>26</sup> *Publications*, p. 102, n. 20.

<sup>27</sup> In which Mr. Chambers anticipates Tupper. He comments (*Modern Language Review*, v, p. 19) on the lines above: "*Chiding and chattering* rightly come under *Wrathe*."

<sup>28</sup> B. v, 87-88.

<sup>29</sup> Pp. 121-22, especially ll. 3515-16, 3525-26.

<sup>30</sup> Pp. 221-22, especially ll. 6887 ff.

<sup>31</sup> P. 145, l. 10.

<sup>32</sup> P. 19.

trouble the branches have given in *Piers Plowman*, even when they are labelled, we may question the mediæval reader's inerrancy, when, without rubrics or tags, he enters upon the merry game of "Cherchez le péché."

The conclusion of the whole matter, of course, lies in the fact which Tupper himself points out: "[Chaucer] derives his story directly from Ovid." And the key to Ovid's narrative is succinctly given in two lines:

*Lingua fuit damno: lingua faciente loquaci,  
Cui color albus erat, nunc est contrarius albo.*<sup>33</sup>

That was quite enough for Chaucer. With Albertano of Brescia "at his beddes heed," the rest was easy.

We have seen that in the "crowning argument" the Parson leads us wofully astray among the branches. What of the element of *irony*? "Amusingly enough, the chief feature of the Prologue of this teller of a tale against Chiding is his long revilement of the drunken Cook... This chiding is reproved by the Host, and the Manciple makes his *amende*."<sup>34</sup> I am "so incautious as to admit that [the Manciple] really does chide the Cook"<sup>35</sup>—as the Host and the Pilgrims "chidde" each other spitously many times in the give and take of the Pilgrimage! The Manciple is not even *primus inter pares*. What I wish to point out is the fact (overlooked by Mr. Tupper) that the Manciple, according to the rigid categories themselves, did not thereby exemplify a Deadly Sin, as "every lewed viker or person" would know. The Parson, who is the last authority, declares explicitly that "sodeyn Ire or hastif Ire, withouten avisement and consentinge of resoun" is different from Ire "that comth of felonye of herte avy-

<sup>33</sup> *Met.*, II, 540-41. Compare the emphasis throughout the story: "loquax" (l. 535), "garrula" (l. 547), and ll. 549-50.

<sup>34</sup> *Publications*, p. 109.

<sup>35</sup> *Journal*, p. 565.

sed and cast biforn." As for the first, "the mening and the sens of this is, that the resoun of man *ne consente nat* to thilke sodeyn Ire; and thanne it is venial."<sup>36</sup> The Manciple says categorically: "That that I spak, *I seyde it in my bourde.*"<sup>37</sup> Even granting (as I do not) that the Tale is a tale of Chiding, the Prologue is not a *Sins Prologue*. Moreover, it may be conceded that Harry Bailly is a fairly good witness. And he suggests (without undue delicacy) in his "reproof" of the Manciple, that that worthy's weak spot is his *Avarice*:

Another day he wol, peraventure,  
Reclayme thee, and bringe thee to lure;  
I mene, he speke wol of smale thinges,  
*As for to pinchen at thy rekeninges,*  
*That were not honeste, if it cam to preef.*<sup>38</sup>

And this is in entire keeping with Chaucer's exposition in the General Prologue, which reaches its climax in the closing line:

And yit this maunciple sette hir aller cappe.<sup>39</sup>

That is good first-hand evidence—if we are Sin-hunting! In a word, Cheste is not properly Chiding; the parallels with the *Parson's Tale* are with two other branches; there is no Chiding in the Tale; Gower's moral (which is not the right one) and Chaucer's have other things in common, but *not* Chiding; Chiding is a branch of other Sins besides Wrath; the Manciple's sort of Chiding is not a mortal Sin in any case; and the Manciple (so far as he is anything) is avaricious. Therefore the *Manciple's Tale* exemplifies "the Chiding phase of Wrath."

Of course it is perfectly obvious that if the *Manciple's Tale* is to stand for Wrath at all, it should be for Wrath in

<sup>36</sup> I, 540.

<sup>37</sup> H, 81.

<sup>38</sup> H, 71-75.

<sup>39</sup> A, 586.

general. Like the *Summoner's Tale* it has its "homily against Ire."<sup>40</sup> The crime itself is committed in Ire (l. 265), and so comes under Homicide, a branch of Ire in practically all the categories.<sup>41</sup> The "rakelnesse" on which Phœbus dwells (ll. 283, 289) is the "Folhaste" of the *Confessio*,<sup>42</sup> the "Fole hastivesse" of the *Mirour*,<sup>43</sup> etc. The address to the crow as "Traitour . . . with tongue of scorpions" (l. 271) identifies the crow as a false flatterer,<sup>44</sup> and the *Parson* includes Flattery under Ire (I, § 40). Similarly, the crow's *lying* (l. 293) comes under Wrath (I, § 39). And we have already seen Jangling, Idle Words, and Betraying of Counsel. The Tale is an amazingly rich *exemplum* of Wrath pure and simple, on Mr. Tupper's own hypothesis. But he has already assigned Wrath to two Tales (the Summoner's and the Friar's) and has managed to expel it from another (the Pardonner's), where it proved embarrassing. It would obviously be overdoing Wrath to bring it in again, except in some special way. That way (at the expense of this veritable treasure-trove of Wrath tags) is through the *Sins of the Tongue*. And this involves still further inconsistencies, which I shall deal with very briefly.

"Chaucer's phase of Wrath (Chiding) in the last tale of the collection might seem to some superfluous after the elaborate exemplification of Wrath in the Friar-Summoner quarrel and tales. But as we have seen, the *Sins of the*

<sup>40</sup> H, 279-91.

<sup>41</sup> *Parson's Tale*, Peraldus, Raymund of Pennaforte, *Pèlerinage*, *Confessio*, *Mirour*, *Ayenbite*, *Jacob's Well*.

<sup>42</sup> III, 1096 ff., 1751 ff., 1861 ff.

<sup>43</sup> Ll. 4741 ff. Compare especially Chaucer's "unavysed" (l. 280) and Gower's "unavised" (*Confessio*, III, 1098)—adding Spenser's "unadvized" (*F. Q.*, I, iv, 34, l. 3).

<sup>44</sup> See B, 404-06; E, 2058-59; *Bk. of Duchesse*, ll. 636-41.

*Tongue well deserve specific exposition.* Compare their place in *Le Mireour du Monde* and the *Ayenbite*.<sup>45</sup> Here the inclusion of Chiding in the scheme is justified, because it *is* a Sin of the Tongue. Twenty-three pages earlier, however, occurs the following statement: “Significantly enough both Chaucer and Gower deem Chiding one of the divisions of Wrath, whereas in many mediæval catalogues of the Sins, this fault is classed apart from the Deadly Seven as a Sin of the Tongue.”<sup>46</sup> That can mean, if I understand English at all, just one thing—namely, that in Chaucer Chiding, as a division of Wrath, is *not* (as in many mediæval catalogues) classed as a Sin of the Tongue.<sup>47</sup> On the one page (where the double treatment of Wrath is justified) the *connection* of Chiding with Sins of the Tongue is stressed; on the other (where the point is the inclusion of Chiding under Wrath) its *disjunction* from Sins of the Tongue is emphasized. But I do not care to dwell on this (at least seeming) discrepancy. It is another matter that concerns us. Mr. Tupper accords to Sins of the Tongue a threefold treatment. First, in many mediæval catalogues of the Sins they are classed *apart* from the Deadly Seven;<sup>48</sup> second, they are included under *Wrath*;<sup>49</sup> third, they are classed with *Gluttony*.<sup>50</sup> As for

<sup>45</sup> *Publications*, p. 125, n. 56.

<sup>46</sup> *Publications*, p. 102. On p. 96, “Chiding, as a Sin of the Tongue, is sometimes found *apart...from its category of Wrath*.”

<sup>47</sup> “It *is*, of course, so classed in Chaucer. The Parson concludes his discourse on Ire as follows: “Thise been *the sinnes that comen of the tongue*, that comen of Ire and of othere sinnes mo” (I, 653). The Parson simply happens to include Sins of the Tongue under *Wrath*.

<sup>48</sup> *Publications*, p. 102 (above).

<sup>49</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 125 (above).

<sup>50</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 125, n. 56: “Compare their place in *Le Mireour du Monde* and the *Ayenbite*.” That place Tupper himself states in “The Parson’s Tavern”: “Dan Michel, in his *Ayenbite of Invit* (pp. 56-57), following *Le Mireour du Monde* (pp. 170-171), discusses, under the

the first, I do not know the “many mediæval catalogues of the Sins” in which Chiding (or any other fault) is classed “*apart from the Deadly Seven* as a Sin of the Tongue.” The Sins of the Tongue are not classed apart from the Seven in any of the categories on which Tupper himself relies, nor does he himself so treat them. The contrary is true, as we shall see. The second is the Parson’s classification, which Tupper here accepts. The third (the usage of the *Ayenbite* and *Jacob’s Well*)<sup>51</sup> he follows in “The Pardoner’s Tavern.” And this is what happens.

Chiding and Blasphemy are Sins of the Tongue in the *Parson’s Tale*, under *Wrath*; they are Sins of the Tongue in the *Ayenbite*,<sup>52</sup> under *Gluttony*. In the *Manciple’s Tale* Chiding deserves specific exposition as a Sin of the Tongue, and (in accordance with the Parson) it is “Chaucer’s phase of *Wrath*.” In the *Pardoner’s Tale* Blasphemy, another Sin of the Tongue, is withdrawn from Wrath (where the Parson puts it), and “knitted up” with *Gluttony*. That is, the Sins of the Tongue (which are included under both Wrath and Gluttony in the categories) are Wrath, when Mr. Tupper is exemplifying Wrath; they are Gluttony, when Gluttony is to be exemplified. To put it another way: the mediæval reader would know, in interpreting the *Manciple’s Tale*, that *Chiding*, one Sin of the Tongue, was *Wrath*; he would also know, in interpreting

*head of Gluttony*, ‘the zennes that byeth ydo ine the taverne’” (*Journal*, p. 559). And in the *Ayenbite*, as Chambers remarks (*Modern Language Review*, v, p. 20): “Evil speaking of all kinds goes with gluttony as being a sin of the mouth (*Ayenbite*, p. 50).” The italics are Chambers’s. Tupper’s reference is scarcely happy as evidence for the place of Sins of the Tongue under *Wrath*.

<sup>51</sup> Sins of the Tongue are classed with absolute explicitness (as “Sins of the Tavern”) under Gluttony in *Jacob’s Well*. See the passage quoted above, p. 274. In the *Ayenbite*, Gluttony and Sins of the Tongue are classed together as Sin of the Mouth (p. 50).

<sup>52</sup> Pp. 65, 89.

the *Pardoner's Tale*, that *Blasphemy*, another Sin of the Tongue, was *Gluttony*. That, however, is not all. The *Manciple's Tale* illustrates *Jangling*, and Mr. Tupper refers Jangling, as we have seen, to Wrath. Here (with its next line added) is the passage from *Piers Plowman* which Tupper quotes<sup>53</sup> in support of his contention that "Great Oaths" denote Gluttony:

Glotonye he gaf hem eke · and *grete othes* togydere,  
And alday to drynke · at dyuerse tauernes,  
And there *to iangle* and to iape · and iugge here euene cristene.<sup>54</sup>

"Great Oaths" and Jangling stand side by side. The first Tupper refers (in the *Pardoner's Tale*) to Gluttony; the second (in the *Manciple's Tale*) to Wrath. The situation, in other words (to put it plainly), is this. *Blasphemy* in the *Parson's Tale* is under Wrath; in *Piers Plowman* it is under Gluttony. When Mr. Tupper wishes to prove the Pardoner the embodiment of Gluttony, he abandons the Parson and follows Piers. *Jangling* in the *Parson's Tale* is under Wrath; in *Piers Plowman* it is under Gluttony. The parallel is exact. When Mr. Tupper wishes to prove the Manciple the embodiment of Wrath, he abandons Piers and holds with the Parson. The tangle in which he has involved himself is hopeless. It could not well be otherwise, on his consistent principle of interpretation—that of selecting out of the mass of conflicting classifications what fits his immediate purpose, and treating the rest as non-existent. I do not believe that Mr. Tupper has realized the inconsistencies into which his initial "fallacy of false assumption"—that of the rigidity of the categories—has betrayed him. But the inconsistencies are there, and they are fatal to his argument.

<sup>53</sup> *Publications*, p. 105, n. 26; *Journal*, p. 561.

<sup>54</sup> B. II, 92-94.

## VIII

"The Wife of Bath," in Mr. Tupper's opinion, "illust-  
rates Pride."<sup>1</sup> More specifically, in the *Wife of Bath's Tale* Chaucer has "handled Gower's theme of Pride (Inobedience)."<sup>2</sup> The latter statement is true, but it is not all the truth. Mr. Tupper fails to tell us that the Tale of Florent in the *Confessio* does not illustrate Inobedience in general, but "*Murmur and Compleaigne*" as a special phase of it.<sup>3</sup> The section begins as follows:

Toward this vice of which we trete  
 Ther ben yit tweie of thilke estrete,  
 Here name is *Murmur and Compleaigne*:  
 Ther can noman here chiere peinte,  
 To sette a glad semblant therinne,  
 For thogh fortune make hem wynne,  
 Yit grucchen thei, and if thei lese,  
 Ther is no weie forto chese,  
 Wheroft heii myhten stonde appesed.  
 So ben thei comunly deseses;  
 Ther may no welthe ne poverte  
 Attempren hem to the decerte  
 Of buxomnesse be no wise.<sup>4</sup>

Indeed, I know no better characterization of the lines that precede the Tale of Florent than Mr. Tupper's own phrase for the Man of Law's Prologue, "a prelude of Murmura-

<sup>1</sup> *Publications*, p. 112.

<sup>2</sup> *Publications*, p. 99.

<sup>3</sup> The section has its own heading: "Murmur in aduersis ita concipit ille superbus, Pena quod ex bina sorte perurret eum. Obvia fortune cum spes in amore resistit, Non sine mentali murmure plangit amans" (I, before l. 1343). The gloss reads: "Hic loquitur de Murmure et Planctu, qui super omnes alias Inobedientias se reciores vt ministri illi deseruunt." And Macaulay's page-heading for the section is "[Murmur and Complaint]."

<sup>4</sup> I, 1343-55. Cf. 1363: "Yit wol thei grucche be som weie"; I. 1378: "Of Murmur and Compleaigne of love"; I. 1385: "I grucche anon"; I. 1389: "With many a Murmur, god it wot"; etc.

tion;"<sup>5</sup> and (as he tells us) "from the mediæval point of view such a prelude of Murmuration is an apt introduction to a tale of Detraction, its sister phase of *Envy*."<sup>6</sup> The application of Tupper's own principles might lead even a mediæval reader astray just here. That, however, in passing. The Tale of Florent is *not* told to exemplify Envy, but the "murmuring or 'grucching' phase" of Inobedience in love.<sup>7</sup> Mr. Tupper's main arguments for Chaucer's similar use of the Tale are two:<sup>8</sup> (i) the homily of the Loathly Lady is directed against Pride in birth and fortune, and "contempt . . . for the poor and humble";<sup>9</sup> (ii) the Wife of Bath herself is the embodiment of Pride in general, and of Inobedience in particular. I grant at once that the elements scattered through the categories may be pieced together into this design. A totally differ-

<sup>5</sup> *Nation*, p. 41.

<sup>6</sup> So again: "We must not be surprised to find that to Chaucer and his fellows . . . Murmuration or 'Grucching' against one's own wretched lot belongs as truly to *Envy* as does Detraction of one's neighbors" (*Publications*, p. 95).

<sup>7</sup> With I, 1382-94 (the lover's description of his silent "grucching" against his lady) compare II, 1781-94 of the tale.

<sup>8</sup> *Publications*, pp. 100-101, 108-09.

<sup>9</sup> Which (like Murmuration) Tupper twice interprets (it will be recalled) as *Envy*. When he says that "this excellent sermon is but an expansion of the commonplaces that *inevitably* appear in all mediæval discourses upon Pride" (*Publications*, p. 100), he is making a strong overstatement. He himself points out on the very next page (n. 15)—as we shall see below—that this is not the case in the *Confessio Amantis*. Nor is it in the *Pèlerinage*; and others might easily be added. He also greatly exaggerates, when he speaks (p. 115) of "the edifying commonplaces (on Gentilesse) with which, in *much the same language*, the Parson has preached against the first of the Vices" (compare also p. 101, n. 14). The test is perfectly easy to make, line by line. Mr. Tupper has forgotten, apparently, Jean de Meun, Boethius, and Dante (in the *Purgatorio*). The influence of the *Convivio* I have just pointed out. See below, p. 348, n. 23.

ent, yet even more “mediaeval” pattern, however, lies ready at our hand. Let us first consider the “homily on Gentilesse.”

According to Mr. Tupper, this homily is a preaching against Pride. And Gentilesse undoubtedly appears under Pride in a number of the categories. But the fundamental question (as Mr. Tupper will be the first to grant) is the use that is made of the Gentilesse passage in the *Tale*. And there, I think, the theory has made a slip. For Gentilesse has a perfectly clear and definite association with the categories, which Tupper has completely overlooked—or rather, which he has seen, but failed to recognize—and it is this association which Chaucer demonstrably had in mind, if he had any. “Strangely enough,” Tupper remarks, “‘Gentilesse’ is introduced under *Sloth* by Gower (*Confessio*, iv, 2200 f.).”<sup>10</sup> The only thing strange is the fact that Tupper has been “sadly puzzled by a design so different from [his] twentieth-century conception” of the Sins. For he has forgotten entirely that Fortitude which, on his own assumption, St. Cecilia exemplified<sup>11</sup>—the familiar *Prowess*, which is the antitype of Sloth. For Gentilesse is a phase of *Prowess* in Gower, and it comes at the conclusion of his account of “the corage of hardiesce [which] Is of knyhthode the prouesce.”<sup>12</sup> The examples of “prouesce” are Lancelot (a knight “of king Arthures hous”), Hercules, Penthesilea, Philemenis, and Æneas. Then comes the conclusion:

<sup>10</sup> *Publications*, p. 101, n. 15.

<sup>11</sup> See above, p. 298.

<sup>12</sup> iv, 2015-16. The discussion of Prowess includes lines 2014-2362. Fortitude, Strength, Force, and Prowess are interchangeable in the categories. Cf. I, § 60: “*Fortitudo* or *Strength*”—which in Frère Lorens (Eilers, p. 570) is “Le don de force,” or “la vertu de proesce.” It is unnecessary to go through the others. See also p. 327 above.

For comunliche in worthi place  
*The wommen loven worthinesse*  
*Of manhode and of gentilesse,*  
*For the gentils ben most desired.*<sup>13</sup>

The lover then asks what Gentilesse is, and the account (which closely parallels the Loathly Lady's in its denial of birth, riches, and contempt of poverty as elements) thereupon follows.<sup>14</sup> Gentilesse, then, precisely as Chaucer interprets it, is one phase of the Prowesse "*that longeth to a knight.*"

What, now, is the situation in the Tale? *The knight is not behaving like a knight.* King Arthur's knight has forgotten knightly Prowess, and with exquisite irony the tables are turned on him. "Is *this* the lawe of king Arthures hous?" Do his knights not know "*of knyghtode the prouesce*, Which is to love sufficant Aboven al the remenant That unto loves court poursuie" ?<sup>15</sup> *The very situation* was provided for in the books. For "*knyghtode of prouesce*" made it incumbent upon the *knight* to say what the Lady, "*smylinge evermo*," found herself compelled to say *for* him. "*Hic docetur*"—so runs the heading of one chapter in the *De Amore* of Andreas Capellanus—"qualiter loqui debeat nobilis plebeiae."<sup>16</sup> And there the knight courteously meets the very objections—in this case raised by the *woman*—which in the Tale are raised by him.<sup>17</sup> Chaucer is not

<sup>13</sup> iv, 2196-99.

<sup>14</sup> Compare: "aschamed of þi poore freendys, pride of þi riche kyn, or of þi gentyl kyn," in *Jacob's Well* (p. 294). And this is under Shrift (which brings "the ȝyfte of strengthe") and Shrift is one part of the armor of Strength or Prowesse (p. 292).

<sup>15</sup> iv, 2016-19.

<sup>16</sup> Ed. Trojel, pp. 70 ff. I quote the heading from the Codex Parisinus.

<sup>17</sup> The Knight speaks: "*Sed in plebeia probitas ex solius animi inata virtute optima mentis dispositione procedit*, et sic quasi natur-

turning aside to preach a little sermon upon Pride; he is developing an exquisitely ironical situation *inherent in the Tale*—a situation whose point depends on the familiar conventions of *Prowesse*. And he makes absolutely clear what he is doing. *It is true Prowesse, which is Gentillesse, that is the Lady's theme:*

Ful selde up ryseth by his branches smale  
*Prowesse* of man; for god, of his goodnesse,  
 Wol that of him we clayme our gentillesse.<sup>18</sup>

She has translated Dante's *probitate* by the very word that places Gentillesse precisely where, in the scheme of the Tale, it belongs. Yet "strangely enough" Gower classes Gentillesse, as Prowesse, under Sloth.<sup>19</sup>

Nor could better evidence possibly be given for the asso-

ale censemur. Tua igitur non possunt exempla procedere, unde merito dicendum credo, *magis in plebeia quam in nobili probitatem esse laudandam*" (p. 72). The woman objects: "Nam quum nobilis sanguine ac generosus inveniaris, patenter ipsi conaris nobilitati detrahere et contra ipsius placitare jura contendis," etc. (p. 73). The knight replies: "Amor enim personam saepe degenerem et deformem tanquam nobilem et formosam repraesentat amanti et facit, eam plus quam omnes alias nobilem atque pulcherrimam deputari . . . *Mirari ergo non debes, si te quamvis ignobilem genere omni tamen decoris fulgore et morum probitate fulgentem tota contendo amare virtute,*" etc. (p. 75). The whole chapter is worth reading in the present connection.

<sup>18</sup> D, 1128-30.

<sup>19</sup> It is interesting to observe, too, that the Gentillesse-Prowesse passage is linked in another way with the theme of the Tale. The key to the story, of course, is the question, four times repeated, "What thing is it that wommen most desyren?" (D, 905, 1007), or, "What wommen loven moost" (D, 985, 921; cf. also D, 925 ff.). In Gower, "The wommen loven worthiness Of manhode and of gentillesse, For the gentils ben most desired" (I, 2197-99). The knight in the Wife's Tale had found out one thing that women loved; he had not discovered all—and he is taught his lesson. Mr. Tupper insists on "the context of romantic love" (*Journal*, p. 555). The Lady's retort courteous is exquisitely pertinent to that.

ciation of Gentilesse with Prowesse (and so for the aptness of its employment in the Tale) than Mr. Tupper himself affords. For he cites the commandments of the God of Love in the *Roman de la Rose*.<sup>20</sup> "The verbal parallels between the Dame's exhortation to 'gentilesse' (D, 1109 f.) and the God of Love's command, *Romaunt of the Rose*, 2187 f., have been often noted with never a thought of the bearing of this relation upon the essential purpose of the Wife's Tale." Tupper adds the four words "of obedience in love."<sup>21</sup> But he has not, I fear, compared the Chaucerian fragment

<sup>20</sup> *Journal*, p. 554.

<sup>21</sup> In this connection Tupper has overlooked, I think, two rather important facts. The first is that "obedience in love" is ("strangely enough," perhaps, but none the less truly) not the antitype of Pride (even of Inobedience) in the *Parson's Tale* (which Tupper has now quite abandoned) at all, nor is it in Frère Lorens (Eilers, p. 568). "Obedience in love" is part of the *remedium against Lechery* in the *Parson's Tale* (§ 80), and it is there considered at great length. Obedience is not necessarily the antitype of Inobedience, any more than Devotion is necessarily the antitype of Undevotion (see above, p. 300, n. 74). Even in Gower (*Mirour*, ll. 12109 ff.), where Obedience is one of the five daughters of Humility, it is not treated from Tupper's point of view, but in its religious aspects. The same is true of the discussion of "Boȝsamnesse" in the *Ayenbite* (pp. 140-41). Obedience is also in the *Parson's Tale* part of the *remedium of Wrath* (I, 674). In *Jacob's Well* (pp. 268-72) Obedience is the "clene grounde" that appears when the gravel beneath the ooze of *Wrath* is removed; it is also (p. 254) part of the ground of Friendship underneath the ooze of *Envy*. I point all this out in the interest of a sympathetic attitude towards the mediæval reader, who was supposed to play his Sins unerringly. The second point is the fact that pride in birth or riches and contempt for the poor (the opposite of Gentilesse) have no immediate connection whatever with *Inobedience*. They belong to a different part of Pride's territory altogether. The homily on Gentilesse is not a harangue against the Wife's own (supposedly) particular type of Pride at all. Mr. Tupper adduces no evidence (nor is there any) that she had either pride of birth or riches, or contempt for the poor.

with the French. Line 2099 in Guillaume<sup>22</sup> is: "N'est pas *proesce* de mesdire."<sup>23</sup> The next line in the French is: "En Keux le séneschal te mire." That is line 2206 in the English translation.<sup>24</sup> *And between the two French lines* are inserted in the English by the translator, as a fit amplification of Guillaume's "*proesce*," the lines to which Tupper refers (2187-2205), which are reminiscences of the *Gentilesse passage in the Wife of Bath's Tale*.<sup>25</sup> That particular man of the Middle Ages who translated the *Roman* understood the Lady's homily (as she did too!) as a discourse upon *Prowesse*, and he inserted it as pertinent comment on *proesce* in his rendering of the God of Love's first command.<sup>26</sup> As for the

<sup>22</sup> Ed. Michel, I, p. 68.

<sup>23</sup> "Proesce" and "gentillèce" appear together in the long passage in Jean de Meun (ed. Michel, II, pp. 251-61) on which Chaucer draws to some extent in the Loathly Lady's discourse. See especially pp. 251, 257, 258. In a paper (*Modern Philology*, May, 1915) which was in the printer's hands before this article was begun, I have presented evidence that in the *Gentilesse* passage in the *Wife of Bath's Tale* Chaucer is drawing largely on Dante's *Convivio*. And it is worth noting that in Dante's discussion of *Gentilezza*, too, this same virtue of *Prowesse* appears. "Il nobile uomo," in his prime of life (between adolescence and old age) must manifest five virtues: "Lealtà, Cortesia, Amore, Fortezza e Temperanza" (*Convivio*, IV, 26, 143-44).

<sup>24</sup> "Thou mayst ensample take of Keye."

<sup>25</sup> I have had for several years abundant proof of this statement, which I shall print when I have time to put the evidence together.

<sup>26</sup> Tupper cites (*Journal* p. 554) the God's command against *Pride*. This command, however, has no bearing on the Lady's homily. Tupper has put a period after l. 2249 in his quotation of the passage, where the text has a comma, thus changing materially the sense of the lines. If he had continued, we should have seen what the God of Love had in mind: "Shun pride—but *dressing well* is not pride"—

Cointerie n'est mie orguiex,  
Qui cointes est, il en vaut miex:  
Por quoi il soit d'orgoïl vuidies,  
Qu'il ne soit fox n'outrecuidies (ll. 2147-50).

stanza from the *Troilus*,<sup>27</sup> that is *Prowesse* too. Not only does the previous stanza give the other aspect of it—"wor-thinesse of manhode" ("And in the feld he pleyde the leoun")—but the last line of the stanza quoted summarizes not only the stanza itself, but also to perfection the Confessor's statement of the results of Prowesse.

Dede were his japes and his crueltee,  
His heigh port and his manere estraunge,  
And eche of tho gan for a vertu chaunge.

So Chaucer; now the Confessor:

. . . for it [love honeste] doth aweie  
*The vice*, and as the bokes sein,  
It makth curteis of the vilein,  
And to the couard hardiesce  
*It yifth, so that verrai prouesse*  
*Is caused upon loves reule*  
To him that can manhode reule.<sup>28</sup>

"So far from being 'irrelevant,' the sermon of the Wife's story is . . . admirably suited to the context of romantic love. *How obvious all this must have been to the mediae-*

And then he goes on with his "costly thy habit as thy purse can buy." He has *already* dealt (under "vilonnie") with what Mr. Tupper has in mind.

<sup>27</sup> *T. & C.*, I, 1079-85. Cited in *Journal*, p. 555.

<sup>28</sup> IV, 2298-2304. Tupper does not note, when he says that Troilus "divests himself utterly . . . of the Sin of *Pride*" that "his japes and his crueltee" are not *Pride* but *Wrath*, or that in another stanza Chaucer says of Troilus:

Thus wolde Love, y-heried be his grace,  
That *Pryde, Envye, Ire, and Avarice*  
He gan to flee, and every other vyce (III, 1804-06).

But the idea is a commonplace in the *Troilus*—and elsewhere. See, for example, Andreas Capellanus: "Effectus autem amoris hic est, quia verus amator nulla posset avaritia offuscarri, amor horridum et incultum omni facit formositate pollere, infimos natu etiam morum novit nobilitate ditare, *superbos* quoque solet humilitate beare," etc. (pp. 9-10).

*val reader!"*<sup>29</sup> Its admirable fitness is indubitable, but would not the thing most obvious to the mediæval reader have been the association—in the Tale itself, in Gower, in Guillaume de Lorris, and in Jean de Meun—of Gentilesse and *Prowesse*?<sup>30</sup>

It may be added incidentally in connection with the "strangeness" of putting Gentilesse under Sloth (where it belongs), that the *Ayenbite* (p. 33) and *Jacob's Well* (p. 112) treat "*Unbuxomness*" *itself* (in precisely the sense of the Parson's use of Inobedience) as a subhead of Sloth. And in Frère Lorens<sup>31</sup> *Inobedience* is a subhead of *Accide*. What, then, was to prevent some mediæval reader who knew *those* categories from putting together an Inobedience (let us say, Sloth) Prologue, and a *remedium* (Prowesse) Tale, precisely as he was to put together an Idleness (Sloth) Prologue and a *remedium* (Prowesse) Tale in the case of St. Cecilia? It would, I think, be difficult to say. So much for the "homily." What of the Wife herself?

"For god it woot, *I chidde hem spitously.*"<sup>32</sup> That

<sup>29</sup> *Journal*, p. 555.

<sup>30</sup> I do not wish the interpretation which I have just given of the Gentilesse passage to be regarded in quite the same light as my purely *ad hoc* construction, on the basis of Fortitudo, in the case of The Tale of Constance (see above, pp. 326 ff.) That the *general* association of Gentilesse and Prowesse (which seems to have been overlooked until Mr. Tupper's remark drew my attention to it) was in Chaucer's mind, there can be, I think, little doubt, in view of his mention of Prowesse in the passage. But I do not believe for a moment that Chaucer was thereby exemplifying *Sloth!* And my present purpose is chiefly to demonstrate that from the mediæval point of view (which Tupper has abandoned) Gentilesse as a phase of *Prowesse* (Sloth) fits the case far better than Gentilesse as an antitype of *Pride*.

<sup>31</sup> Eilers, p. 535. "*Unbuxomness*" also appears under *Avarice* in *Jacob's Well* (p. 135).

<sup>32</sup> D, 223.

is the key to the Wife of Bath's place among the Sins, if such a place she has to have. Beside her the Manciple is a farthing-candle to the sun. What the Parson says of *Inobedience* is this:

Inobedient, is he that disobeyeth for despyt to the commandementes  
of god and to hisse sovereyns, and to his goostly fader.<sup>33</sup>

What the Parson says of *Chiding* is (among other things) this:

And how that chydinge be a vileyng thing bitwixe alle manere  
folk, yet it is certes most uncovenable bitwize a man and his wyf;  
for there is nevere reste. And therfore seith Salomon, 'an hous  
that is uncovered and droppinge, and a chydinge wyf, been lyke.'<sup>34</sup>  
A man that is in a droppinge hous in many places, though he es-  
chewe the droppinge in o place, it droppeth on him in another place;  
so fareth it by a chydinge wyf. But she chyde him in o place, she  
wol chyde him in another. And therefore, 'bette is a morsel of  
breed with joye than an hous ful of delyces, with chydinge,' seith  
Salomon. Seint Paul seith: 'O ye wommen, be ye subgetes to youre  
housbondes as bihoveth in god; and ye men, loveth youre wyves.'<sup>35</sup>

*That* is where the Parson puts the Wife of Bath, and *that* is where he classes *Inobedience* in the sense in which Tupper is applying it. And even though Tupper himself keeps forgetting his own crowning argument, we may not: "*The Parson's portrayal of the Vices* thus enters into the framework of the Sins Tales and makes obvious the 'application' of each."<sup>36</sup>

<sup>33</sup> I, 392.

<sup>34</sup> Cf. D, 278-80.

<sup>35</sup> I, 630-34.

<sup>36</sup> *Publications*, p. 116. The Inobedient Wife appears under Pride (besides her appearance in the *Mirour*, which Tupper—*Publications*, p. 109—points out) in the *Cursor Mundi*, ll. 28152-55 ("I womman haue vn-buxum bene And tarid myn husband to tene, In many thyng pat i suld don, And noght queþer my lagh vndon") and *Jacob's Well*, p. 72 ("Also þou wyif, vnþuxom to þin husbonde vñleffully, þou servaunt vnþuxom to þi mayster," etc.). In all these cases the reference is (like "gruching against poverty" under Envy) a single minor detail in a larger treatment.

And, indeed, the Wyf's Prologue is a very antiphonal of chiding "bitwixe a man and his wyf."

For god it woot, *I chidde hem spitously* (223).  
 And if I have a gossib or a freend,  
 With-outen gilt, *thou chydest as a feend* (243-44).  
 Thow seyst that dropping houses, and eek smoke,  
 And *chyding wyves*, maken men to flee  
 Out of hir owene hous; a! *ben'cite!*  
*What eyleth swich an old man for to chyde?* (278-81).  
*Ther wolde I chyde and do hem no plesaunce* (408).  
 That made me that *ever I wolde hem chyde* (419).  
 'Bet is,' quod he, 'thy habitacioun  
 Be with a leoun or a foul dragoun,  
*Than with a womman usinge for to chyde.*  
 'Bet is,' quod he, 'hye in the roof abyde  
 Than with *an angry wyf* doun in the hous' (775-79).

And where in the world is there such matchless chiding as that which the Wife rehearses with fresh gusto for the pilgrims' ears, in the consummate tirade<sup>37</sup> with which she parallels the Pardoner's self-revelation? Beside her robust phrases the Parson's "thou holour," "thou dronkelewe harlot" pale their uneffectual fire: "sir olde lechour"; "olde barel ful of lyes"; "sire olde fool"; "olde dotard"; "sir shrewe"; "olde dotard shrewe"; "lorel"; "sir olde kaynard"—"never did I hear such gallant chiding"! Moreover, the other branch which Tupper links with Chiding is there too. Is the Manciple's morality directed against *Jangling*? "Stiborn I was as is a leonesse, And of my tonge *a verray jangleresse*" (637-38). Is Gower's emphasis in his Tale of Cheste upon "*biwreying of conseil*"?

To hir, and to another worthy wyf,  
 And to my nece, which that I loved weel,  
*I wolde han told his conseil every-deel.*  
*And so I dide ful often, god it woot.*<sup>38</sup>

<sup>37</sup> D, 235-378.

<sup>38</sup> D, 536-39.

Would not the mediæval reader begin to smell *Wrath* in the wind? And it would be with likelihood to lead him, too. Does the *Friar's Tale* represent "the *Cursing* phase of *Wrath*"? Beside the Wife of Bath old Mabely is the veriest amateur:

With wilde thonder-dint and firy leveñe  
Mote thy welked nekke be to-broke! <sup>39</sup>

Is it "attri angre" that we wish, to give good measure?

... in his owene grece I made him frye  
*For angre*, and for verray jalouslye.  
*By god*, in erthe I was his purgatorie— <sup>40</sup>

which reminds the man of the Middle Ages that "*swering*" is wrath too. As for actual *Strife* (*Tençon*, *Contek*, what you will):

I with my fist so took him on the cheke,  
That in our fyr he fil bakward adoun.  
And he up-stirte as dooth a wood leoun,  
And with his fist he smoot me on the heed,  
That in the floor I lay as I were deed.<sup>41</sup>

The mediæval reader must have revelled in the signs of Wrath, "as thikke as motes in the sonne-beem." <sup>42</sup>

But Wrath, of course, does not make up the Wife's sum.

<sup>39</sup> D, 276-77.

<sup>40</sup> D, 487-89.

<sup>41</sup> D, 792-96.

<sup>42</sup> That they were so read we know on the testimony of the one unimpeachable, first-hand witness that we have—the Clerk of Oxford. For the Clerk, at the close of his Tale, sets the Wife of Bath over against Griselda. And Griselda is the type of Patience, and Patience (still to keep the point of view demanded by the theory itself) is the antitype, not of Pride, but of *Wrath*. (It is so in the *Parson's Tale*, §§ 50-52, in the *Mirour*, ll. 13381-14100, and in the *Confessio*, III, 612-713; cf. 1-18, 1098, etc.). And the matchless irony of the Clerk's Envoy is directed against the very Chiding to which the Wife herself has given the first place—"the arwes of [hir] crabbed eloquence." If we are to think in terms of the Sins at all, the verdict of the Clerk of Oxford is unequivocally for *Wrath*.

Mr. Tupper has had much to say about Virginity, in connection with his Tale of Lechery. But he passes over in silence (as he passed over the Friar's homily on Gluttony) the Wife's long and explicit depreciation of Virginity (which occupies the first part of her Prologue), her frank distaste for Chastity,<sup>43</sup> and her outspoken avowal of her own "likerousness"<sup>44</sup>—except that he gently refers to her as "the epitome of worldly affection."<sup>45</sup> Nor has he said a word of her *Gluttony*, the "ny cosin" of Lechery:

And, after wyn, on Venus moste I thinke:  
For al so siker as cold engendreth hayl,  
A likerous mouth moste han a likerous tayl.<sup>46</sup>

Even her "love of fine clothes"<sup>47</sup> meant more than Pride:

. . . what wiste I when my grace  
Was shapen for to be, or in what place?  
Therefore I made my visitaciouns . . .  
And wered upon my gaye scarlet gytes.<sup>48</sup>

In Absolon's expert phrase, "That is a signe of kissing atte leste." To the mediæval mind the Wife of Bath's Prologue was thick inlaid with signs of Lechery and Wrath. And when Mr. Tupper says that her other traits "are nei-

<sup>43</sup> See, for example, ll. 46, 138, etc.

<sup>44</sup> Ll. 604-26; and *passim*.

<sup>45</sup> *Publications*, p. 108. He does, however, recognize her "desclaiming" of Virginity, in connection with his Saint Venus theory (*Nation*, Oct. 16, 1913, p. 355, col. 3). It furthers there; it hinders here.

<sup>46</sup> D, 464-66. See the rest of the passage.

<sup>47</sup> *Publications*, p. 108.

<sup>48</sup> D, 553-55, 559. See 550-62, and cf. 337-61. "Now as of the outrageous array of wommen," says the Parson, ". . . yet notifie they in hir array of atyr *likerousnesse* and prude" (I, 429). For the same implications, compare the warnings against fine clothes (among them "curchefs crisp and bendes bright") under *Lechery*, in the *Cursor Mundi* (ll. 28018 ff., 28514 ff.), and cf. Deschamps, *Miroir de Mariage*, ch. XLII.

ther so dominant nor conspicuous as that phase of *Pride*, which she . . . proclaims, with all the frankness of the Pardoner, to be her chief fault—‘Unbuxomness’ or ‘Inobedience’ in love”<sup>49</sup> —in saying that, he is substituting an inference for a fact. The Pardoner *does* proclaim frankly that Avarice is his chief fault; the Wife of Bath proclaims with equal frankness that she is “al Venerien,” “likerous,” “vinolent,” “a verray jangleresse,” a chider, a betrayer of secrets. *Inobedience* is Mr. Tupper’s inference, not her proclamation. I have not the least intention of denying that the Wife of Bath was proud—“unbuxom,” if you will; she was, as Mr. Tupper says, a “complex personality.”<sup>50</sup> But in order to make her stand for “Inobedience in love,” Mr. Tupper has to throw overboard the Parson, who puts the chiding and inobedient wife under *Wrath*; overlook entirely the light which Gower, Guillaume de Lorris and his translator, and the Wife herself throw on the place of *Gentilesse* “in a context of romantic love”—a place which connotes the anti-type of *Sloth*, not of *Pride*; and minimize the most salient features (including *Lechery*) of the Prologue as it stands. And that he *is* imposing his own inferences upon facts, he has himself made clear.

For he has treated Barclay in precisely the same way. But Barclay, unlike Chaucer, uses *labels*, so that we have a check. Among the types preserved in the *Ship of Fools*, Mr. Tupper tells us, is “the *Proud* and Shrewish Wife.”<sup>51</sup> He gives no reference, but the line which he quotes<sup>52</sup> identifies the passage. It is the first portrait in the second volume. Its actual title is: “Of the yre im-

<sup>49</sup> *Publications*, pp. 108-09.

<sup>50</sup> *Publications*, p. 108.

<sup>51</sup> *Journal*, p. 556.

<sup>52</sup> II, 5—second line from foot of page.

*moderate, the wrath and great lewdness of wymen*" (in the *Tabula*: "Of wymens malyce & wrath"). Professor Tupper is absolutely right in his implied parallel with the Wife of Bath; it is patent throughout the thirty-eight stanzas. In this case, however, the type is tagged, and the tag is not what Mr. Tupper gives. That again—his "*Proud and Shrewish Wife*,"—is *his* interpretation of facts, the *mediaeval* interpretation of which we can this time verify. In the 304 lines of the poem there is just one mention of *Pride* (p. 7): "Hir proude aparayle sholde make his thryst ful thyn"—which Tupper paraphrases: "Emptying by her proud apparel her husband's purse." Tupper's next phrase—"acknowledging *Pride* as lady and mistresse" (which forms the climax of his paraphrase of Barclay's picture)—is nowhere in the poem. It is interpretation pure and simple, unwarranted by fact. The lines which *do* follow are:

As well can some spende as theyr good man can wyn  
 And moche faster, but if that coyne do fayle  
 She labowryth nat to get it without syn  
 But crafteily to forge it with hir tayle.

In view of the *title*, it is scarcely necessary to enumerate the "tags" of Wrath and Lechery of which the poem is full—chiding, again and again (four times on page 4); wrath; cruel words; rancor; etc., etc. These Mr. Tupper mentions too,—only to bring in *Pride* as his climax, exactly as in the case of the Wife of Bath. Yet Barclay's conclusion is explicit. He puts the "unbuxom" *wife* precisely where the Parson puts her, namely, under *Wrath*. The Envoy begins:

*Ye wrathfull wymen* by vyce lesyng your name . . .  
 Let *chastyte* you gyde and *pacienc*e.  
 For to be frowarde, it is a thyng in vayne

Vnto hym to whom ye owe obedyence.  
The lawe commaundyth you to do reverence  
Vnto your spousys with honour and mekenesse, etc.<sup>53</sup>

The parallel with the Wife of Bath is perfect. Mr. Tupper's interpretation in the one case is at sharp variance with the mediaeval point of view. And the evidence I have given points to a similar variance in the other.<sup>54</sup>

The Wife of Bath is a magnificent abstract of the Deadly but Delightful Seven—all their strength and all their sweetness rolled up into one ball! So is Falstaff; so (in her excellent differences) is Cleopatra. And who is there to match them? They are the lust of the flesh, and the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life—and more!—incarnate. But neither the Wife of Bath nor her peers may be cabin'd within the confines of a Sin. The supreme creations of the poets and the categories of the theologians have a common source—the mingled yarn of *life*. Each comes by its own separate path from that, and each in its own way embodies it. But it is a fatal fallacy to confound cognates with derivatives.

<sup>53</sup> P. 10.

<sup>54</sup> Beginning on p. 122 of his *Publications* article, Mr. Tupper proceeds to discuss the blending of the "Sins motif" with the "love motif," which he had earlier elaborated in the *Nation*, Oct. 16, 1913 (Vol. 97, No. 2520), pp. 354-56. Once more I plead guilty to welcoming at the outset what seemed to be new light, only to find, upon closer investigation, that (to me at least) the light was darkness. In spite of much that is suggestive in the first *Nation* article, its method is open to many of the same objections that lie against the treatment of the "Sins motif." But this last theory stands or falls altogether independently of the first, and I do not wish to prolong a discussion that has exceeded bounds already. I shall therefore pass over this part of Mr. Tupper's argument.

## IX

The truth of the whole matter is that Mr. Tupper wishes us to play a game in which there are no rules. The deal is nothing—one may pick one's cards. Ace may be high in one hand, low the next. Trumps may or may not take the trick. One does not even have to follow suit. Out of the maze of the categories, with their nebulous dividing lines, their innumerable overlappings and interlacings, one may choose at will, ignore at will, combine at will. By such a method anything whatever may be proved. And that is easy to demonstrate. Now that Tupper has fished the murex up, Nokes may outdare Stokes in azure feats. It is possible to prove, with scrupulous adherence to the principles on which Mr. Tupper's theory is based, that at least three more Tales should be added to his list. And in so doing I shall again confine myself rigidly to his own authorities.

The *Monk's Tale*, in the first place, exemplifies *Pride*. The Parson, in his discourse "De Superbia," has stated the theme of the Tale as clearly as the Monk:

Certes also, who-so prydeth him in the goodes of fortune, he is a ful greet fool; for som-tyme is a man a greet lord by the morwe, that is a caitif and a wrecche er it be night: and somtyme the richesse of a man is cause of his deeth;<sup>1</sup> somtyme the delyces of a man is cause of the grevous maladye thurgh which he dyeth.<sup>2</sup> Certes, the commendacioun of the peple is somtyme ful fals and ful brotel for to triste;<sup>3</sup> this day they preyse, tomorwe they blame.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Compare *Croesus* (B, 3917 ff.).

<sup>2</sup> Compare *Antiochus* (B, 3789 ff.).

<sup>3</sup> Compare *Nero* (B, 3717 ff.).

<sup>4</sup> I, 470. Compare also the *Ayenbite* (p. 24) for the wheel of Fortune, and Pride; *Jacob's Well* (p. 78) for comments, under Pride, on the text: "Qui se exaltat, humiliabitur"; and in general compare *Jacob's Well*, p. 237; *Pèlerinage*, ll. 14233-42; *Mirour*, ll. 1274-96, 1828-31, 2596 ff.; etc.

And the "present purport" of the *exempla* is unmistakable. *Lucifer* exemplifies *Pride* in Dante,<sup>5</sup> Pope Innocent,<sup>6</sup> the *Confessio*,<sup>7</sup> the *Mirour*,<sup>8</sup> the *Ayenbite*,<sup>9</sup> the *Pelerinage*,<sup>10</sup> Wyclif,<sup>11</sup> Lydgate,<sup>12</sup> and Barclay;<sup>13</sup> *Adam*, in the *Pelerinage*,<sup>14</sup> the *Confessio*,<sup>15</sup> and Barclay;<sup>16</sup> *Nebuchadnezzar*, in the *De Contemptu*,<sup>17</sup> the *Pelerinage*,<sup>18</sup> the *Confessio*,<sup>19</sup> and the *Mirour*,<sup>20</sup> *Belshazzar*, in Barclay;<sup>21</sup> *Holofernes*, in the *De Contemptu*,<sup>22</sup> Dante,<sup>23</sup> and Barclay;<sup>24</sup> *Antiochus*, in the *De Contemptu*<sup>25</sup> and Barclay;<sup>26</sup> *Cæsar*, in Lydgate.<sup>27</sup> Nor does the Monk himself leave us in doubt regarding his "formal intent":

This *proude* king (3349); This king of kinges *proud* was and elaat (3357); For *proud* he was (3376); And he was *proud* (3402); Eek thou . . . art *proud* also (3413); More *proud* was never emperour than he (3662); The hye *pryde* of Nero (3710); The more pompous in heigh *presumpcioun* (3745); His hye *pryde* (3767); The *proude* wordes that he seyde (3770); Fortune him hadde enhaunced so in *pryde* (3773); Wening that god ne mighte his *pryde* abate (3780); God daunted al his *pryde* and al his *bost* (3799); Swich guerdon as bilongeth unto *pryde* (3820); Yit was he caught amiddes al his *pryde* (3919); Of which he was so *proud* (3931); Cresus, the *proude* king (3949).

And the conclusion of the whole matter is no less explicit:

<sup>5</sup> *Purg.*, XII, 25-27.

<sup>9</sup> P. 16.

<sup>6</sup> *De Contemptu Mundi*, II, 31.

<sup>10</sup> Ll. 14030 ff.

<sup>7</sup> I, 3299 ff.

<sup>11</sup> Ed. Matthew, pp. 2, 3, 123.

<sup>8</sup> Ll. 1873 ff.

<sup>12</sup> *Story of Thebes and Troy-book* (see *Serpent of Division*, ed. MacCracken, pp. 5-6).

<sup>13</sup> II, 159, 163-65.

<sup>20</sup> Ll. 1886 ff.

<sup>14</sup> Ll. 14048 ff., 14435 ff.

<sup>21</sup> II, 165.

<sup>15</sup> I, 3303-04.

<sup>22</sup> II, 32.

<sup>16</sup> II, 165.

<sup>23</sup> *Purg.*, XII, 58-60.

<sup>17</sup> II, 32.

<sup>24</sup> II, 162, 165.

<sup>18</sup> Ll. 14220 ff.

<sup>25</sup> II, 32.

<sup>19</sup> I, 2785 ff.

<sup>26</sup> II, 165.

<sup>27</sup> *Serpent of Division*, pp. 50 (l. 3), 65 (l. 28). Cæsar is also an *exemplum*, in the *Serpent*, of Fortune's mutability; see p. 65, ll. 21 ff.

Tragedie is noon other maner thing . . .  
 But for that fortune alwey wol assaille  
 With unwar strook *the regnes that ben proude.*<sup>28</sup>

The Tale itself, then, is, from Mr. Tupper's point of view, an unsurpassed "morality" on Pride.

The element of *irony*, moreover, could scarcely be more striking. The Monk himself might have been drawn to exemplify the Parson's discourse on Pride. His "ful many a deyntee hors" (A, 168) parallels the "manye delicat horses" against which the Parson inveighs (I, 430); his jingling bridle (A, 169-70) repeats the "curious harneys" and the "brydles covered with . . . barres and plates of gold and of silver" (I, 433); his "sleves purfled at the hond With grys, and that the fyneste of a lond" (A, 193-94) recall the "costelewe furringe in hir gounes" (I, 417); his love for a fat swan (A, 206) is the Parson's "Pryde of the table" (I, 444).<sup>29</sup> The Monk is guilty of the very Sin against which he tells his Tale.

Nor is there the slightest question regarding the "crowning argument." We have seen that the *Parson's Tale* both states the theme of the Monk's *exempla*, and gives the direct suggestion for the irony. I submit that no one of all Professor Tupper's candidates meets the requirements of the theory so perfectly as mine. Yet in this case we know with absolute certainty just what the Monk *did* mean

<sup>28</sup> B, 3951-54.

<sup>29</sup> So "grete hors" are mentioned by Wyclif as one "ensaumple" of the pride of prelates (ed. Matthew, p. 30); compare the still fuller and more explicit statements on pp. 60, 92, 121. With the Monk's "grehoundes" (A, 190) compare the delight "yn horsys, haukys, or yn houndes" (especially in the case of clerks) in *Handlyng Synne* (ll. 3083-86). Tupper has used the General Prologue in his treatment of the Wife of Bath (*Publications*, p. 108), so it is open to us here. But in any case the theory allows for "after-thoughts."

to exemplify—namely, *the fickleness of Fortune*. For we have not only his initial and his closing statements of his purpose, the explicit rehearsal of the point at the close of *exemplum* after *exemplum*,<sup>30</sup> the numerous references to Fortune in the body of the *exempla*,<sup>31</sup> the Knight's entire understanding of the point,<sup>32</sup> the Host's concurrence in the Knight's recognition of the purport of the Tale,<sup>33</sup> but we have also the similar *exemplum* treatment of the same theme in Chaucer's sources, Boccaccio and Jean de Meun, together with the whole mediæval conception of the Monk's specific term, "tragedie." Unless "Chaucer was quite in the dark about himself," the *Monk's Tale* is not a "Sins Tale." Yet it bears all the ear-marks that the theory requires.

It is, however, not the only one. The *Nun's Priest's Tale* is also an exemplification of *Pride*, in its branch *Flattery*. One need only recall the Tale to recognize its purport, but this time we have the "tag" as well:

Allas! ye lordes, many a fals flatour  
*Is in your courtes, and many a losengeour,*  
 That plesen yow wel more, by my feith,  
 Than he that soothfastnesse unto yow seith.  
*Redeth Ecclesiaste of flaterye;*  
*Beth war, ye lordes, of hir trecherye.*<sup>34</sup>

And the close of the Tale "is the traditional ending of an 'ensample' of Sin"; indeed, "nothing could be more in the true *exemplum* manner":

<sup>30</sup> Ll. 3325 ff., 3429 ff., 3557 ff., 3587-88, 3647 ff., 3740, 3858-60, 3912-16.

<sup>31</sup> Ll. 3191, 3566, 3591, 3635-36, 3709-10, 3746-47, 3773-74, 3823, 3851-52, 3868, 3876, 3884, 3924, 3927.

<sup>32</sup> Ll. 3957-69.

<sup>33</sup> Ll. 3970-77.

<sup>34</sup> B, 4515-20. This follows the line: "So was he ravished with his *flaterye*."

Lo, swich it is for to be recchelees,  
 And necligent, *and truste on flaterye*.  
 But ye that holden this tale a folye,  
 As of a fox, or of a cok and hen,  
 Taketh the moralitee, good men.  
 For saint Paul seith, that al that writen is,  
 To our doctryne it is y-write, y-wis.  
 Taketh the fruyt, and lat the chaf be stille.<sup>35</sup>

That is, of course, enough, but the Nun's Priest has given us still further help, through hints delightfully obvious to adepts in the Sins. Chanticleer "song merier than the mermayde in the see."<sup>36</sup> Now it is not only "Phisiologus" who discourses on the mermaid's singing. *Flattery's* song, in the *Pèlerinage*, "ys swettere... Than off mere-maydenys in the se."<sup>37</sup> In the *Ayenbite*, flatterers and mis-sayers "byeþ þe tuo nykeren þet we uyndeþ ine bokes of kende of bestes... þet habbeþ bodyes of wyfman and... zuetelich zingeþ... þet byeþ þe blonderes."<sup>38</sup> In *Jacob's Well*, "losengers, in þe book of kynde, are lykenyd to a mermayden of þe se... and sche syngeth so merye in þe se" etc.<sup>39</sup> The connotation of the simile is unmistakable.<sup>40</sup> And, indeed, Chanticleer was himself a flatterer. As Miss Petersen has pointed out, "he addresses polite and elegant flattery to Pertelote, and enjoys the mockery of the Latin tribute which she cannot understand."<sup>41</sup> There is, accordingly, in the Tale, the delicate irony of the flatterer flattered, just as we have (in Mr.

<sup>35</sup> B, 4626-33. The "exemplum formula" becomes even more explicit in the closing prayer (ll. 4634-36).

<sup>36</sup> B, 4460. Incidentally, *singing* (*Handlyng Synne*, p. 107), or one's *voice* (*Jacob's Well*, p. 69), is one of the gifts which lead to *Pride*.

<sup>37</sup> Ll. 14688-93.

<sup>38</sup> P. 61.

<sup>39</sup> P. 150.

<sup>40</sup> And, I imagine, was present in Chaucer's mind—yet without Sin.

<sup>41</sup> *On the Sources of the N. P. T.*, p. 91.

Tupper's opinion) the curser cursed in the *Friar's Tale*.<sup>42</sup> Moreover, the choice of the *fox* is itself significant. The fox's tail is the symbol of the flatterer in the *Mirour*,<sup>43</sup> the *Ayenbite*,<sup>44</sup> and *Jacob's Well*,<sup>45</sup> and in the last two, flatterers are, therefore, "ycleped in writinge: tayles."<sup>46</sup> And finally, the *exemplum* has pointed a like moral elsewhere. For the fable of the fox and the raven occurs as an "Exaumple" under Pride in the *Pèlerinage*.<sup>47</sup> And the moral there is clear. Like the cock, the raven "koude nat espye Hys [the fox's] tresoun nor hys flaterye,"<sup>48</sup> and Pride asserts that the deceit was wrought "thorgh the blast off flaterye."<sup>49</sup> We have, then, the testimony of an analogue. Moreover, Flattery is included under Pride in the *Mirour*,<sup>50</sup> the *Pèlerinage*,<sup>51</sup> the *Ayenbite*,<sup>52</sup> and *Handlyng Synne*.<sup>53</sup> "It is interesting that the Parson, like Peraldus, includes [Flattery] under [Wrath]. This arrangement, however,"<sup>54</sup> puts the Parson hard to it, as everybody knows.<sup>55</sup> And this unusual collocation, in the light of the other authorities, need not trouble us.<sup>56</sup> The *Nun's Priest's Tale* is an *exemplum* of Flattery; it is

<sup>42</sup> And as in the *Friar's Tale* so here Chaucer "doubles the story's aptness" by making the *fox*'s downfall the punishment of *his* Pride:

Lo, how fortune turneth sodeinly  
The hope and *pryde* eek of hir enemy!—

and Chantecleer's counter-trick follows.

<sup>43</sup> Ll. 1405-10.

<sup>44</sup> P. 61.

<sup>45</sup> P. 150.

<sup>46</sup> *Ayenbite*, p. 61; cf. *Jacob's Well*, p. 150. In the *Pèlerinage* Pride's mantel of Hypocrisy is lined with fox-skin (ll. 14590 ff.).

<sup>47</sup> Ll. 14247-89.

<sup>48</sup> Ll. 14645-14762.

<sup>48</sup> Ll. 14275-76.

<sup>49</sup> P. 23.

<sup>49</sup> Ll. 14283-89.

<sup>50</sup> Ll. 3501 ff.

<sup>50</sup> Ll. 1369 ff.

<sup>51</sup> *Journal*, p. 562.

<sup>55</sup> See the last five lines of I, § 40.

<sup>56</sup> Flattery is also among the Sins of the Tongue in the *Ayenbite* (p. 60) and *Jacob's Well* (p. 149). It is treated under the Points of Policy in the *Confessio* (vii, 2177-2694).

therefore a "Sins tale"; and its place, in accordance with the weight of authority, is under *Pride*.

As for the element of *irony*, "no Prologue specifically indicates the [Nun's Priest's] peculiar disqualification for his theme of [Flattery]; but the mediæval reader must have been tickled by [a sermon against Flattery] from a profession notorious, in the fourteenth century,"<sup>57</sup> for its use of flattery to attain its ends. The pages of Wyclif teem with references to the employment of flattery by ecclesiastics:

But what man comeþ now to ony fat benefice or prelacie wiþouten zifte of money or servyce, or flateryng? . . . Who getiþ ony fat benefice of þe Bischop of Rome wiþouten siche flateryng?<sup>58</sup> þei flatren lordis . . . & þeuen lordis grete ziftis of gold & iuelis & pardons.<sup>59</sup> A symple pater noster of a plouȝman þat his in charite is betre þan a þousand massis of eoueitouse prelatis & veyn religious ful of . . . fals flaterynge.<sup>60</sup>

But we need not rely on Wyclif for the evidence. Every mediæval reader must have seen the irony at a glance. For in innumerable versions of the tale "the fox and various other animals *play the part of priest.*"<sup>61</sup> Indeed, as Miss Petersen points out, "the 'monking' of the enemy

<sup>57</sup> *Publications*, p. 110.

<sup>58</sup> Ed. Arnold, III, p. 281.

<sup>59</sup> Ed. Matthew, p. 63.

<sup>60</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 274. Cf. pp. 237, 246, etc.; *Mirour*, ll. 21250-21432. Compare also the Summoner's remark (D, 1294) about the "*flateringe limitour.*" As for the Nun's Priest, Professor Lawrence has pointed out—not, I hasten to add, in even remote connection with the present theme—that he "is subject to a lady who is his ecclesiastical superior" (*Modern Philology*, xi, p. 254). He was therefore at least in a position where flattery might "avaunce." And we know that the prioress loved "chere of court," and "as forto speke [of] court real . . . there it [flaterie] is most special" (*Confessio*, vii, 2209-10). "This suggestion . . . is only a plausible conjecture."

<sup>61</sup> Petersen, p. 43.

is one of the commonest forms of this general theme,”<sup>62</sup> and her numerous examples of the fox as priest, from both mediaeval tales and mediaeval sculpture,<sup>63</sup> offer ample evidence. In the tale itself, in other words, *the arch-flatterer frequently takes the guise of the very class to which the teller of the tale belongs.* The irony is complete. “How obvious all this must have been to the mediæval reader!”

As for the “crowning argument,” the *Nun’s Priest’s Tale*, like that of the Physician, “confesses in its moralities no indebtedness or close resemblance to the Parson’s discussion of the corresponding Vice; but this omission seems the less striking, when we remark the generous use of the section on [Pride] in the [Monk’s Tale].”<sup>64</sup> The *Nun’s Priest’s Tale*, accordingly, fulfills all the requirements of an *exemplum* of Pride (Flattery). Moreover, it should be observed that if we accept the order of the Tales to which Mr. Tupper (I believe rightly) subscribes,<sup>65</sup> the Wife of Bath’s Prologue and Tale immediately follow the *Nun’s Priest’s Tale*. We have, therefore, three Pride Tales in succession—the Monk’s (Pride in general), the Nun’s Priest’s (Pride in its phase of Flattery), the Wife of Bath’s (Pride as Inobedience)—a treatment worthy of the Vice which is “des autres capiteine.”<sup>66</sup>

Finally (since the time would fail me to tell of all), the *Merchant’s Tale* is a perfect exemplification of *Lechery*—not this time by way of its antitype, but directly, and with an astonishing inclusiveness. January is one of “thise olde dotardes holours”<sup>67</sup> for whom the staid Parson

<sup>62</sup> P. 42.

<sup>63</sup> Pp. 42-45.

<sup>64</sup> *Publications*, p. 116.

<sup>65</sup> *Nation*, Oct. 16, 1913, p. 355; *Publications*, p. 97. See Lawrence, *Modern Philology*, xi, pp. 256-57, for a fuller statement of the evidence.

<sup>66</sup> *Mirour*, l. 1045.

<sup>67</sup> I, 857. Compare the masterly description in the Tale, E, 1842-54.

employs a simile unsurpassed for vividness by any modern master of a realistic pen. We have his habits before his marriage (E, 1248-50); his use of aphrodisiacs (E, 1807 ff.); "avoutrie bitwixe a man and his wyf";<sup>68</sup> adultery between Damian and May—there are few details in the categories that could not be illustrated from the Tale.<sup>69</sup> Moreover, as regards the "crowning argument," Professor Tatlock has pointed out that "the *Parson's Tale* is quoted in the *Merchant's* more frequently than in any other of Chaucer's works except the *Pardoners Prologue and Tale*."<sup>70</sup> Even Mr. Tupper, in explaining why *his* Tale of Lechery fails to borrow from the *Parson's Tale* at all, remarks "the generous use of the section on Lechery in the so-called Marriage Group, particularly in the *Merchant's Tale*."<sup>71</sup> And the argument from irony is at least as good in the case of the *Second Nun's Tale*. For over against one reference to lazy nuns I shall set one reference to lecherous merchants: "þei [false marchautis] lyuen in glotonye, dronkenesse & lecherie as hoggis."<sup>72</sup> Anyway, on Mr. Tupper's own law of compensation, the meagreness of the argument from irony may be offset by the uncommon richness of the crowning argument.

The *Clerk's Tale* and the *Franklin's Tale* afford, by way of antitypes, a no less fruitful field. Their conformity

<sup>68</sup> I, 904, 858; cf. *Jacob's Well*, p. 161; etc. It is unnecessary to rehearse the passages from the Tale.

<sup>69</sup> Mr. Tupper's Tale of Lechery exemplifies (through its *antitype*, and through thwarted *intent* alone) only "that phase of Lechery" which consists in "birev[ing] a mayden of hir maydenhede" (*Publications*, p. 97, n. 7).

<sup>70</sup> *Development and Chronology of Chaucer's Works*, p. 202. See Herrig's *Archiv*, LXXXVII, pp. 35-36, 41-43; *Modern Philology*, VIII, pp. 171-75.

<sup>71</sup> *Publications*, p. 116.

<sup>72</sup> *Wyclif*, ed. Matthew, p. 186.

at point after point with the requirements of the categories is amazing, but I must leave them, as by no means uninteresting pastimes, to others. My greatest regret is that space forbids the unfolding of the latent possibilities of Harry Bailly as an exponent of the Sins! But the *Monk's Tale*, the *Nun's Priest's Tale*, and the *Merchant's Tale* (together with the perfectly sound variant interpretations of the *Summoner's Tale*, the *Man of Law's Tale*, and the *Wife of Bath's Tale* given above), are enough to show that Mr. Tupper's theory proves too much.

## X

In conclusion, I wish to point out, with the utmost brevity, that in dissenting from Mr. Tupper's thesis we are not relinquishing those elements of Chaucer's art of which the theory has skilfully availed itself. Mr. Tupper has so dexterously interwoven with the other strands of his fabric certain of Chaucer's most familiar characteristics, that, in refusing to accept this particular pattern as Chaucer's design, we are put in the position of seeming to deny to *Chaucer* the qualities that have been thus combined. The fallacy is one that has been forced upon us, and it requires a word or two in closing.

In the first place, Chaucer makes abundant use of the Seven Deadly Sins. He dealt with life, and life, like the categories, is a labyrinth of the Vices and the Virtues. And since he lived in an age when theology had a "large place . . . in the intellectual interests of cultured lay Englishmen"<sup>1</sup>—not to speak of cultivated lay Frenchmen, Italians, Spaniards, and Germans—he calls the Vices

<sup>1</sup> *Journal*, p. 553.

freely by their names, and talks of them in terms of their conventional associations. In this he is at one with Dante, Boccaccio, Jean de Meun, and his contemporaries all and some. But that is one thing, and a formal schematizing of the Seven Deadly Sins in the *Canterbury Tales* is quite another. To deny the second is by no means to gainsay the first.

In the second place, Chaucer is thoroughly mediæval in his use of *exempla*. The "clear-eyed scholar" whom Mr. Tupper quotes<sup>2</sup> spoke the words of truth and soberness when he remarked that Chaucer follows "the line of least resistance by falling into the well-worn *exempla* track." But when Mr. Tupper declares—putting the words ironically into the mouth of some one of the "Peter Bells of scholarship"—that "being of the fourteenth century he [Chaucer] utterly failed to recognize that, as an artist, *he was absolutely debarred from pointing the moral*—that is in his tales of the Sins"<sup>3</sup>—in saying this, Mr. Tupper is not only erecting a man of straw, but he is also identifying Chaucer's facts with his own interpretation of those facts, and assuming that Chaucer's moral and his own are one. Chaucer has used *exempla*,

<sup>2</sup> *Journal*, p. 554.

<sup>3</sup> *Publications*, p. 127. The same fallacy appears on the preceding page: "That the 'moralities' are there, he who runs may read. That they are 'moralities' of the Sins, no one can doubt who takes the trouble to compare them with Chaucer's own formal description of the Vices (*Parson's Tale*) or with the traditional traits of these evil passions in mediæval theology." With the first sentence one may heartily concur, and I fear that the frequent proclamation of the "utter aimlessness and irrelevancy" of Chaucer's moralizing which Tupper deplores is "fantom and illusioun"—a ghost of his own raising. As for the second sentence, it was precisely the comparison which Tupper there suggests that changed the present writer's doubt to certainty, and led to this statement of the *results* of the comparison.

and has used them with consummate art—an art whose fine appositeness Mr. Tupper's theory has done much to blur. Nothing more artistically perfect than the employment of the *exemplum* by the Pardoner, the Nun's Priest, the Monk, the Summoner, the Friar, and the Prioress, could well have been devised. But Mr. Tupper has read many mediæval sermons, and turned the pages of innumerable *exemplum* books. Would he venture to suggest that the range of the *exempla* is coterminous with the Seven Deadly Sins, and their application limited by the confines of the categories? Dissent from his theory admits fullest recognition of the unique place of the *exemplum* in Chaucer's art.

Furthermore, Chaucer's unsurpassed and unsurpassable *irony* is independent of any formal schematizing of a group of Tales. This mastery of irony on Chaucer's part is no discovery of Mr. Tupper's, nor would he for a moment claim it as his own. *Vixere fortis ante Agamemnona multi.* What he has seemingly overlooked is the fact that ironical inconsistency between precept and practice has been the fruitful theme of comedy and satire from Aristophanes to Meredith, with no thought of the Seven Deadly Sins. Ungracious pastors, who show the steep and thorny way to heaven, whilst themselves the primrose path of dalliance tread, and reck not their own rede, do not thereby become the formal exponents of a Vice. One may keep the "delicious inconsistency," without the Sin. And most of the ironical inconsistencies which Mr. Tupper sees are inconsistencies of his own making—the creations of pure assumption, "plausible conjecture," hypothetical "afterthoughts," adjustments "for the nonce." *For this particular type of irony* the evidence, in the case of all the Tales but one, is either wholly wanting or ambiguous. And in that one, where Chaucer *does*

oppose rule of life to dogma, *he makes his meaning unmistakable:*

*Thus can I preche agayn that same vyce  
Which that I use, and that is avaryce.<sup>4</sup>*

Chaucer does employ this sort of irony; but when he does, he relies on no ambiguous giving out. One cannot lose what one has never had, and nothing is taken from Chaucer's irony, if the tellers of the Tales are left as Chaucer drew them.

And finally, there is Chaucer's *art*. For that too Mr. Tupper has identified with his own particular conception of it. "Obviously he [Chaucer] did not share the modern tenet<sup>5</sup> that, while illustrations of masculine or feminine submissiveness in the married state are entirely worthy of a poet's art, *pointed revelations of the cardinal emotions must be deemed degrading to his genius.*"<sup>6</sup> I had thought that pointed revelations of the cardinal emotions were among Chaucer's glories, not his shame, and had been dull enough to think that others thought so too. If, however, by "pointed revelations of the cardinal emotions" Mr. Tupper means "the architectonic use of the motif of the Deadly Sins," I can only quote his next five words: "Fallacious indeed is the reasoning." When Mr. Tupper or anyone else shall demonstrate that Chaucer, at the height of his powers, reverted from the glorious liberty he had attained, to the more or less schematic tendencies of his earlier period, one may unhesitatingly (even though with somewhat of a sad perplexity) readjust one's opin-

<sup>4</sup>C, 427-28. Chaucer is no less unequivocal, for instance, in his matchless juxtaposition of practice and precept in the friar's suggestions for his dinner (D, 1838-47); etc.

<sup>5</sup>Where this tenet (which follows) is found outside Mr. Tupper's own pages it would be interesting to know.

<sup>6</sup>*Publications*, p. 127.

ions in conformity with established facts. Meantime, one may hold to the conviction, based on such knowledge as we have, that the development was the other way. If, however, as I believe, "the presence and prominence of the Sins *motif* completely collapses under scrutiny,"<sup>7</sup> the question of its bearing upon Chaucer's art becomes a purely academic one. And I shall not discuss it here.

This task has been entered upon and carried through reluctantly. But the far-reaching significance of the principle of interpretation which I am combating has left me (believing as I do) without alternative. I have examined Professor Tupper's argument with rigorous observance of the mediæval point of view, not stepping once outside what has been laid down as "absolutely essential to the proper interpretation of [Chaucer's] poetry," to wit, "his horizon, that is, his strict confinement within the bounds of fourteenth-century thought."<sup>8</sup> So far as the Seven Deadly Sins are concerned, I have refrained with scrupulous care from the point of view of "the casual reader of today," and have done my devoir "to plumb the depths and shallows of mediæval thought."<sup>9</sup> As a result it is necessary to say that what has "sadly puzzled" some of us in the view so ably presented in the articles under review is not "a design so different from [our] twentieth-century conception of a poet's province." It is a design so acutely at variance with the modes of fourteenth-century thought. It is not the mediæval conception that seems strange; it is the modern metamorphosis of that conception.

JOHN LIVINGSTON LOWES.

<sup>7</sup> *Publications*, p. 126. Of course in Mr. Tupper's sentence the phrase which I have quoted is preceded by the words: "The objection to."

<sup>8</sup> *Journal*, p. 553.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 554.